


UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO



3 1761 01356089 1







Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation






100

535

527





C Smith RHA.

H. Adlard.

*Yrs very truly R Dublin*

LIFE AND CORRESPONDENCE  
OF  
RICHARD WHATELY, D.D.

LATE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

BY  
E. JANE WHATELY

AUTHOR OF 'ENGLISH SYNONYMS.'

---

IN TWO VOLUMES.—VOLUME I.

---

LONDON:  
LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
1866.

255-08  
15/12/92

CT

808

W5W5

V.1

## PREFACE.

---

IN BRINGING the Memoir of my father before the public, I do it with a full consciousness of the disadvantages under which a Biography, compiled by one standing in so near a relation to its subject, must necessarily labour. A portrait taken from so close a point of view, though it may contain more of delicate and minute touches than one taken at a distance, can never be so complete as a whole; and any attempt to keep this circumstance out of sight, by writing as a stranger, would have destroyed the truthfulness of the portrait without adding to its completeness. The only way in which this disadvantage could be at all obviated, was by leaving the subject of the Memoir, as far as possible, to speak for himself; and although he left neither diary nor autobiography, the mass of correspondence in my hands has enabled me in a considerable measure to effect this object.

In the difficult task of supplying the gaps left by the correspondence in literary and political history &c. I have received most important aid from Herman Merivale, Esq.,

to whose valuable services in revising and preparing the whole Work for the press I am greatly indebted. The additions which he has made to the Narrative are distinguished throughout by an asterisk at the beginning and end of each passage.

To those kind friends who have contributed portions of correspondence and personal recollections to the Work, I desire here to express my most grateful thanks.

E. J. WHATELY.

BRIGHTON: *May* 1866.

# CONTENTS

OF

## THE FIRST VOLUME.

---

### CHAPTER I.

1787—1821.

His Parentage and Birth—Premature Development of his Tastes for Mathematics and Castle-building—His School Days—Keeps a Commonplace Book—His Absence of Mind early displayed—His Intellectual Characteristics—Enters Oriel College, Oxford—Influence of Dr. Copleston—Takes his Degrees—His Habits of Intimacy with his Pupils, and Early Friendships—Reminiscences of his Pupils—Ordained Deacon in 1814, and first Public Preaching—Bishop Hinds' Recollections of Whately, and Interesting Anecdotes—Dialogue in a Stage-coach with a Roman Catholic Farmer—Visits the Continent, and passes the Winter in Portugal with his Sisters—Resumes his College Duties on his return—His Mode of Teaching—Reminiscences of the Rev. R. N. Boulton—A Table Anecdote . . . . . PAGE 1

### CHAPTER II.

1821—1828.

Commencement of his active Literary Career—A Contributor to the 'Encyclopædia Metropolitana'—His 'Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Buonaparte' and other Works—His Marriage—Appointed Bampton Lecturer—Removes to Halesworth—Illness of Mrs. Whately—Takes his D.D., and is appointed Principal of Alban Hall—Literary Society at Oxford—Testimony of Dr. Newman—of Dr. Mayo—Instances of his powers of Anecdote and Repartee . . . . . 41

### CHAPTER III.

1828—1830.

Fragment on Controversial Writings—Letter to Dr. Copleston—His plan for Educating his Children—Sir Robert Peel and Catholic Emancipation—Supports Sir Robert, which leads to a breach with his

early friends—Rupture with Dr. Newman — Elected Professor of Political Economy—Letter on School-house Lectures—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill—Interests himself for the Re-election of Sir R. Peel—Publishes the ‘Errors of Romanism.’—Letter on National Distress—Letter on University Examinations—Proposal for gradual Abolition of Slavery . . . . . PAGE 57

CHAPTER IV.

1831.

Letter to Mr. Senior on Parliamentary Reform—Letter to the same on forming a Political Economy Society—His Appointment to the See of Dublin—Various Opinions respecting his Elevation—Appears at a Levée without his Order—Climbing Feats of his Dog—Dissatisfaction at his Elevation—Speech of the Bishop of Exeter—Dr. Whately’s Opinions respecting the Fourth Commandment—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on his Appointment to the Primacy—Letter to Lady Mary Shepherd—Starts for Dublin—Attacked by a Birmingham Mob—Narrow Escape at Holyhead. . . . . 87

CHAPTER V.

1832.

State of Protestant Church in Ireland—Question of Tithes—Arrives at Dublin—Enters on his Official Duties—His Hospitable Reception—His Country-house at Redesdale—Anecdote of his Rustic Life—His simple Tastes and Pursuits—Apportions his Time—Letter to Lord-Lieutenant on Tithes—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on State of Ireland—His First Charge, and consequent Exposure to Public Obloquy—Letter to Dr. Pusey on National Judgments—Establishment of National Education System—Renewed Hostility to the Archbishop and his Measures—Founds a Professorship of Political Economy—Speech at the formation of the Statistical Society—His Weekly Levées—Anecdotes of his Confirmation Tours—His Monthly Dinners—Anecdotes of his Controversial Powers, and of his Efforts to Suppress Mendicancy—Letter to Mr. Senior on Transportation—Letter to Earl Grey on Church matters—Letter to Mr. Senior on Ecclesiastical Government—Letter to Earl Grey on same subject—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Reform Bill—Letters to Miss Crabtree—Letter to Mr. Senior on Secondary Punishments—Letter to the Hon. Mr. Stanley on curtailing a Clergyman’s Salary—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on University matters—Letter to Lord Grey on Church Reform—His Opinions on Secondary Punishments—Letter to Sir T. Denman on same subject. . . . . 116

## CHAPTER VI.

1833.

Rev. J. Blanco White resides with the Archbishop, and is appointed Tutor to the Archbishop's Family—Letter to Mr. Badeley on the Clerical Society—Letter to Miss Crabtree—Letter to the Howard Society on the Penalty of Death—Letter to the Anti-Slavery Society—Letter to Mr. Senior—Takes his Seat in Parliament—Speeches on Irish Education and Irish Emancipation—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Church Temporalities Bill—Notes on same Subject—Retirement of Dr. Hinds, and Appointment of Dr. Dickinson as his Successor—Associated with Archbishop Murray in Commission of Inquiry on Irish Poor—His Independent Conduct—Letter to Mr. Stanley on the Establishment of a Divinity College—Letter to Mr. Hull on Church Affairs—Letter to a Friend on Religious Difficulties—Letter to a Young Clergyman—Fragment on the Sabbath Question . . . PAGE 178

## CHAPTER VII.

1834—1835.

Letter to Mr. Senior on a 'Statistical Dictionary'—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Divinity College—Letter to Rev. J. E. Tyler and Dr. Blomfield illustrative of his Magnanimity—Letter to Earl Grey on University Reform—Letter to Dr. Hawkins on Church matters—His tender regard for the Feelings of Men—Letters to and from Dr. Newman respecting their Differences of Opinion on Church matters—Paper on Church Temporalities Bill—Letters to Mr. Senior on Church affairs, &c.—Mr. Blanco White, embracing Socinian views, retires from the Archbishop's Family—Grief on this account manifested by the Archbishop, who subsequently Pensions Mr. White . . . . . 214

## CHAPTER VIII.

1835.

Letters to Rev. J. Blanco White on his Unitarian views, and consequent Secession from the Church . . . . . 250

## CHAPTER IX.

1835.

Visits Tunbridge Wells—Letter to Mr. Senior on Tithes and Church Property—On Public Pledges—Letter to Marquis of Wellesley on Church matters—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Lord Melbourne on National Education—Letters to Mr. Senior, &c., on Church and

State questions—Report of a Conversation with the Archbishop on various subjects—Letter to Mr. Senior on the Tithes Bill—Letter to Lord Melbourne on Tithes—Letter to Mr. Carlisle on the Sabbath question—Letter to a Friend . . . . . PAGE 290

## CHAPTER X.

1836.

Visit of Dr. Arnold—Letters to Lord Stanley on Church affairs in Ireland—Pressed by Mr. Senior to exchange for an English Bishopric—Letter to Mr. Senior on same Subject—His views on the Importance of Moral over Intellectual Education—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Irish Church—Letter to Rev. J. Tyler on *Neutrality* in case of Dr. Hampden—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on University Examinations—Letter to Mr. Senior on various Subjects connected with Church and State . . . . . 342

## CHAPTER XI.

1837.

Letter to a Clergyman on Religion—Letters to Rev. J. Tyler on Invocation of Saints, &c.—Letter to Dr. Dickinson—Letters to Bishop of Norwich on Irish Church Questions, &c.—Letter on 'Evidences of Christianity'—Letter to Blanco White, and generous Concern for his Welfare—Letter to Dr. Dickinson on Abolition of Superfluous Oaths—Letter to Lord John Russell—Letter to a Lady on State of Ireland—Table Talk: on Tractarianism—Letter to Mr. Senior on Colonisation—His Views on the Government Poor-law Measure for Ireland—Letters to Mr. Senior on same Subject—Petition to the Queen on Administration of Oaths by Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick . . . 369

## CHAPTER XII.

1838.

Letter to Dr. Arnold on the London University—Letter to Mr. Senior on Colonising New Zealand, &c.—Letter on various Subjects—His practice regarding Anonymous Letters—Revisits Oxford—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Letter to Mr. Senior on Irish Education—Misrepresentations from the Stationery Office and others respecting the Education Board . . . . . 408

## CHAPTER XIII.

1839.

Letters to Rev. Baden Powell on his Work 'Tradition Unveiled'—Letters to Mr. Senior on Irish Education, Relief, &c.—Letter to Rev.

Dr. Dickinson—Starts on a Continental Tour—Visits the Field of Waterloo—Conversation with the King of the Belgians—Letter to Dr. Dickinson on Switzerland and Italy—Makes the Acquaintance of M. Sismondi—Letter to Mr. Senior on 'Travelling'—Disappointed at the Failure of his Scheme for a new Divinity College—Misrepresentations of the Scheme—Returns to Dublin—Letters to Mr. Senior on various Subjects—Urged by his Friends to attend Parliament—Letter on the Subject—Letter to Miss Crabtree—Madame Fabre translates the 'Lessons on the Evidences of Christianity'—Letter to M. Fabre on the Translation . . . . . PAGE 422

## CHAPTER XIV.

1840.

Letter to Dr. Hinds on 'Tradition,' &c.—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Attends Parliament—Letters to Mr. Senior on his Parliamentary Attendance—Letters to Dr. Dickinson—Introduced to M. Guizot—Letter to a Clergyman soliciting for a Parish—Hints to Transcendentalists—Visits Tenby—Letter to Dr. Hinds on Church History—Renewed Intercourse with M. Sismondi—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Lady Osborne on her Praying for the Archbishop—Appointment of Dr. Dickinson to the Bishopric of Meath—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Letter on the Elevation of Dr. Dickinson—Dissolution of Parliament—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Letter to Dr. Hinds on 'Absolution' and on Fairy Tales—Letter of Advice to one Troubled with Religious Difficulties . . . . . 444

## CHAPTER XV.

1841.

Letter to Mr. Senior on the Merits of two Anonymous Personages—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Letter to Miss Crabtree on a Mathematical Question—Accident to Mrs. Whately—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Letter to Mr. Senior on 'Tract No. 90'—Interview with Dr. Pusey—Death of his friend Blanco White—Visits Ems with his Family—Letter to Dr. West—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Returns to Ireland—Letter to Mr. Senior on Irish Education—Letter on same Subject . . . . . 477

TO THE BINDER.

- PORTRAIT of ARCHBISHOP WHATELY, from the }  
 picture by C. Smith, R.H.A. . . . . } *Frontispiece to Vol. I.*  
 PORTRAIT of ARCHBISHOP WHATELY, from a }  
 photograph by Mason . . . . . } *Frontispiece to Vol. II.*

# LIFE AND REMAINS OF ARCHBISHOP WHATELY.



## CHAPTER I.

1787—1821.

His parentage and birth—Premature development of his tastes for mathematics and castle-building—His school days—Keeps a Commonplace Book—His absence of mind early displayed—His intellectual characteristics—Enters Oriel College, Oxford—Influence of Dr. Copleston—Takes his degrees—His habits of intimacy with his pupils, and early friendships—Reminiscences of his pupils—Ordained deacon in 1814, and first public preaching—Bishop Hinds' recollections of Mr. Whately, and interesting anecdotes—Dialogue in a stage-coach with a Roman Catholic farmer—Visits the Continent, and passes the winter in Portugal with his sisters—Resumes his college duties on his return—His mode of teaching—Reminiscences of the Rév. R. N. Boulton—A table anecdote.

THE subject of this memoir was the youngest of the nine children of the Rev. Dr. Joseph Whately, of Nonsuch Park, Surrey, and Prebendary of Bristol—also Vicar of Widford, and Lecturer at Gresham College. Before proceeding to detail his personal history, a few words respecting his family may not be out of place. The Whately family numbered in its ancestry some persons of note; among them was the famous ‘painful preacher’ of Banbury, a puritan divine of some eminence, whose Treatise on the New Birth is still extant.

The father of Dr. Joseph Whately connected himself by marriage with the Thompson family, of which Lord Haversham<sup>1</sup> was the head, and some members of which had been distinguished, on the side of the Parliament, in the civil wars. His wife appears to have been a remarkable woman; her portrait by Romney, now in the possession of one of her great-grandsons, gives the impression of a mind of no ordinary stamp; and she was regarded by her children with deep reverence. She had three sons. \*One of them (Thomas) was private secretary and confidential friend to George Grenville, and afterwards Under-Secretary of State, M.P. for Castle Rising, and (to use the singular title of his office given in the 'Gentleman's Magazine') 'Keeper of His Majesty's private Roads, and Guide to the Royal Person in all Progresses.' It was he to whom Hutchinson and Oliver addressed from Massachusetts those celebrated letters which got, by unfair means, into the hands of Franklin, and produced so great an effect at the outbreak of American discontent. On his death, in 1772, his brother William became lawful owner of these papers, and thought himself obliged to fight a duel with Mr. John Temple on account of them.<sup>2</sup> Thomas Whately was the author of an 'Essay on Modern Gardening' (1770), of which the Archbishop says that he believes him to have been 'the earliest writer on the subject. From his work subsequent writers have borrowed largely, and generally without acknowledgment. The French poet De Lille, however, in his poem "Des Jardins," does acknowledge him his master.'<sup>3</sup> He also wrote 'Remarks on some of

<sup>1</sup> Sir John Thompson, Bart., created Baron Haversham, Bucks, in 1696. Extinct in his son, 1745.

<sup>2</sup> See Lord Stanhope's 'History of England,' c. 50.

<sup>3</sup> 'Annotations on Bacon,' Essay xlvii., 'On Gardens.'

the Characters in Shakspeare,' re-edited by the Archbishop.\*

Dr. Joseph Whately (the third) was married to Miss Jane Plumer, one of the three daughters of W. Plumer, Esq., of Gilston, and also of Blakesware Park, Herts. This last, an ancient dower-house, where the widow of Mr. Plumer resided with her daughters, is interesting from the notice of it in Charles Lamb's Essays. Lamb's grandmother, Mrs. Field, was the housekeeper, and every reader of 'Elia' will remember the allusions in it to early recollections of this place, now pulled down.

Dr. and Mrs. Joseph Whately were the parents of nine children, five daughters and four sons, all of whom lived to maturity, and most of them to old age.

The eldest son, William, was early engaged in business, afterwards turned his attention to law, married late in life, and died without children a few years after. The second, Thomas, was appointed to the living of Cookham, near Maidenhead, and afterwards to Chetwynd in Shropshire; he married a sister of Charles first Earl of Cottenham, and survived his brother Richard only six months, dying at the age of ninety-one, and leaving a numerous family.

The third, Joseph Thompson, married an heiress, the daughter of T. Halsey, Esq., of Gaddesden, Herts, took the name of his wife, and died in 1818, leaving four children.

Of the five daughters, the eldest died in the prime of life; the fourth and only surviving one is the widow of the late Sir David Barry,<sup>1</sup> an eminent physician; the three others died unmarried at an advanced age.

Richard, the youngest child, was born on the 1st of

\* *H. M.*

<sup>1</sup> Lady Barry died on August 17th, 1866, while this work was going through the press.

February 1787, in Cavendish Square, at the house of his maternal uncle, Mr. Plumer, then M.P. for Hertfordshire. His birth took place six years after that of the next youngest child, when the family had been long supposed complete, and the 'nursery' in the house had ceased to exist. The arrival of the new-comer was an unlooked-for and scarcely a welcome event. He was feeble in health, and his slight and puny appearance must have strangely contrasted with the powerful, tall, and well-proportioned form of his maturer age. His friends have often heard him remark, that the earliest event of his life was his being weighed against a turkey, to the advantage of the bird; and that he never in childhood knew what a really healthy appetite was; the sensation of hunger was to him something new and strange, when he first felt it as a boy of eleven or twelve.

In disposition he was shy, timid, and retiring; he knew little of the high spirits and playfulness of early childhood, and the society of children of his own age was actually distasteful to him. From all company he shrank with a nervous dread; and would often in after-life express wonder at the pleasure which children and young people usually take in social intercourse, and the desire of notice which they manifest.

In his own family he met with most attentive personal care from his elder sisters; but none of his brothers were sufficiently near him in age to be his companions, and his early tastes and pursuits were not likely to meet with general sympathy or appreciation. He learned to read and write very early, and read with avidity; but his great delight was in the observation of nature. He would spend hours in the garden, watching the habits of spiders, taming young ducklings, and carrying them in his hand to pick snails from the cabbages, learning to distinguish

notes of birds, &c. And to the results of these early observations he would often allude in after-years.

But his most remarkable early passion was for arithmetic. In this he displayed a singular precocity. At six years old he astonished his family by telling the celebrated Parkhurst, his father's near neighbour and intimate friend, and a man of past sixty, how many *minutes* he was old. His calculations were tested, and found to be perfectly correct. But an extract from his Commonplace Book will best give an idea of this curious episode in his early life.

‘There certainly was,’ he writes, ‘something peculiar in my calculating faculty. It began to show itself between five and six, and lasted about three years. One of the earliest things I can remember is the discovery of the difference between even and odd numbers, whose names I was highly delighted to be told; I soon got to do the most difficult sums, always in my head, for I knew nothing of figures beyond numeration, nor had I any names for the different processes I employed. But I believe my sums were chiefly in multiplication, division, and the rule of three. In this last point I believe I surpassed the famous American boy, though I did not, like him, understand the extraction of roots. I did these sums much quicker than any one could upon paper, and I never remember committing the smallest error. I was engaged either in calculation or in castle-building (which I was also very fond of) morning, noon, and night; and was so absorbed as to run against people in the streets, with all the other accidents of absent people.

‘My father tried often, but in vain, to transfer my powers to written figures; and when I went to school, at which time the passion was worn off, I was a perfect dunce at cyphering, and so have continued ever since. Thus was

I saved from being a Jedediah Buxton, by the amputation, as it were, of this overgrown faculty. For, valuable as it is in itself, it would have been a heavy loss to have it swallow up the rest. It was banished by a kind of ostracism, as the best of the Athenian citizens were, for the benefit of the community.'

Thus far his own words. He has often remarked that he would at that time have been perfectly happy shut up in the Bastile, if permitted to follow his favourite pursuit undisturbed.

At the time he went to school, which was at about nine years old, this passion died away, and, as he subsequently thought, he then learned arithmetic slowly and with difficulty. He always looked on himself as a dunce in that line, though the readiness with which he solved curious problems and arithmetical puzzles would often surprise and baffle first-class mathematicians. The clearness of his explanations of the *processes* of arithmetic was always remarkable; but he was never distinguished as a mathematician at college.

But the other taste which he alludes to in the fragment given above—that for 'castle-building'—remained, and became more fully developed. His were not the usual childish flights of fancy, but rather visionary speculations on a variety of abstract subjects, metaphysical, political, and ethical; fancied schemes for ameliorating the world, ideal republics, &c. In those early days, when his absence of mind excited laughter, and it would be, half pityingly, half contemptuously, prophesied by his friends that he would 'never be able to make his way in the world,' the mind of the boy was preoccupied with conjectures and speculations, which have often found place in the writings of philosophers of maturer age. He himself has related how, while still a child, it occurred to him that the con-

sciousness of brutes must be analogous to that of human beings in a dream, when the power of abstraction at pleasure is gone.

This view he confirmed in later life; but with regard to many theories of government, civilisation, &c. he was accustomed to remark, 'I went through that when I was twelve; such a system I thought out when I was thirteen or fourteen,' and so on. His family afterwards regretted that he had not been sent to a public school; but whether this would have suited his peculiar cast of mind so well as the training he was thus unconsciously giving himself, may perhaps be doubted.

At the age of nine he was sent to the school of a Mr. Philips, in the neighbourhood of Bristol. This school in great measure determined the friendships and connections of his subsequent life. With one of his schoolfellows in particular (Mr. J. Parsons, afterwards son-in-law to Mr. Philips) he formed a close intimacy, which was only dissolved by death; and through this early friend he was afterwards brought into intimate relations with others who attended the same school after he left: among the principal of these were Mr. Rowe and Dr. Hinds. Mr. Philips's school was much resorted to by West Indians, and this gave him a familiarity with the customs and habits of the West Indies, which often appeared in his conversation and writings. The smallest incident which tended to throw light on national peculiarities, climate, or institutions, had always a peculiar interest for him, and was stored up in his memory from the time he heard it.

Of his master he often spoke afterwards as remarkable for his personal influence over his pupils—an influence which did not spring from any extraordinary talent, but from some nameless power or quality in him, which

certainly conduced in no small degree to the general good conduct and order of the school.

In his Common-place Book allusions will be found to his leading the sports of his companions; but, on the whole, his school-life does not appear to have been a happy one. His thoughtful and meditative turn of mind was hardly fitted for ordinary schoolboy contact. Much of his leisure time was spent, as it had been at home, in solitary wanderings and observations in natural history; he would delight in straying over a common near the playground, watching the habits of the sheep, and trying to tame them, and other similar occupations.

At ten years old he lost his father, the one of his family best able to appreciate his powers and peculiar turn of mind. This early bereavement he always deplored, and ever retained a lively recollection of conversations with his father, even at that early period.

Mrs. Whately removed with her five daughters and youngest son to Bath, where she passed the remainder of her life.

Of the period just preceding his entrance into college scarcely any records remain. His habits of solitary reflection and his interest in natural science appear to have been the same all along. Of fishing he was particularly fond. Throughout life, he retained his love for active exercise in the open air. His only surviving sister recollects another trait—the kind and unselfish consideration which made him, then and later, take pains to procure her horses and to ride with her, horse exercise being recommended for her health.

Though a most acute and watchful observer, where any principle was to be illustrated or induction made, he saw little at other times of what passed around him. His mind was eminently concentrative, and he often re-

marked in later life that, inconvenient as this habit was to him, he still owed everything in life to it. It enabled him to bring all his mental powers to bear on the subject before him, but, on the other hand, it made the operation of turning from one topic to another more intensely and painfully difficult; and thus naturally produced the absence of mind referred to, which was one of his most remarkable characteristics, especially in the earlier period of his life. \*He speaks with regret, in his *Commonplace Book* (1812), of his deficiency in the quality which he terms Curiosity. 'By this means,' he says, 'I believe I lose more amusement, and suffer more inconvenience, than if I was indifferent to many dignified and excellent subjects of enquiry which I delight in. I have no relish for ordinary chat, which consists in the reciprocal gratification of the above passion; nor, consequently, for the company of a great part of the world, who have little to say that has anything but novelty to recommend it. It gives me no pleasure to be told who is dead, and who married, and what wages my neighbour gives his servants. Then, for the inconvenience, I am ignorant of the streets, and shops, and neighbouring villages of the town where I live. I very often know a man, without being able to tell any more about his country, family, etc., than if he had dropt from the skies. Nor do I even know, unless I enquire and examine diligently, and with design, how far it is from one place to another, what hour the coach starts, or what places it passes through. I am frequently forced to evade questions in a most awkward manner, from not daring to own, nor indeed able to convince any one of, my own incredible ignorance. If I had had no uncle or aunt, I should, probably, have been ignorant of my mother's maiden name.'

These prefatory remarks may serve to introduce the

reader to a few of those peculiar characteristics of his mind and of his labours, which will be more fully developed in the course of the correspondence now laid before him. From the beginning, and emphatically, Whately was a thinker. His favourite authors were few : Aristotle, Thucydides, Bacon, Bishop Butler, Warburton, Adam Smith ; these were, perhaps, his principal intimates among great writers ; and it will be easily seen that they are among the most ‘ suggestive ;’ among those who could furnish the most ready texts on which his ruminating powers might be expended. But one unavoidable result of this comparative want of reading, in one who thought and wrote so much, was, that he continually stumbled upon the thoughts of others, and reproduced them in perfect honesty as his own. This was one of his characteristics through life. It is singular to read one of his early critics<sup>1</sup> commenting on his tendency to reproduce the ‘ commonplace of other writers, not unfrequently, without any apparent consciousness of their ever having seen the light before ;’ while one of his latest, Mr. Stuart Mill, speaking of his philosophical investigations, says that ‘ of all persons in modern times, entitled to the name of philosophers, the two, probably, whose reading was the scantiest, in proportion to their intellectual capacity, were Archbishop Whately and Dr. Brown. But though indolent readers they were both of them active and fertile thinkers.’\*

\*Activity and fertility were certainly, beyond all others, the characteristics of Whately’s intellect. As in the early school and Oxford days, of which we are now writing, so down to his latest times, the daily occupation of his brain was to seize on some notion of what he considered a practical order, belonging to any one of the various

<sup>1</sup> ‘ British Critic,’ 1828, on his ‘ Difficulties of St. Paul.’

subjects with which his mind occupied itself; to follow it out to its minutest ramifications, and to bring it home with him, turned from the mere germ into the complete production. And this perpetual 'chopping logic with himself' he carried on not less copiously when his usually solitary walks were enlivened by companionship. His talk was rather didactic than controversial; which naturally rendered his company unpopular with some, while it gave him the mastery over other spirits of a different mould. 'His real object, or his original objects,' writes one of his earliest and ablest friends, 'was to get up clearly and beat out his ideas for his own use. Thus he wrote his books.' Mr. R., lately dead, who was junior to Whately as a fellow of Oriel, told me that, in one of his walks with him, he was so overcome by Whately's recurrence, in conversation, to topics which he had already on former occasions insisted on, that he stopped short, and said, "Why, Whately, you said all this to me the other day:" to which Whately replied to the effect that he would not be the worse for hearing it many times over.\*

In the company of a few chosen friends he delighted; but the intercourse with general society, and the ordinary routine of a town life, were to him irksome in the extreme. He was then, and even later, most painfully shy; and the well-meant efforts of his friends to correct this defect, by constantly reminding him of the impression he was likely to make on others, served to increase the evil they were intended to combat. In the pages of his *Commonplace Book* he records how at last he determined to make a bold effort, and care nothing for what others might be thinking of him; and, to use his own words, 'if he must be a bear, to be at least as unconscious as a bear.' And the effort succeeded. The shyness passed away; and though his manners might have still a certain abruptness

and peculiarity about them, the distressing consciousness which made life a misery was gone. That this was no trifling hindrance removed from his path, was attested by his frequent emphatic remark in later years: 'If there were no life but the present, the kindest thing that one could do for an intensely shy youth would be to shoot him through the head!' \* 'He could be most touchingly gentle in his manner,' says an old friend, 'to those whom he liked; but I recollect a lady saying she would not for the world be his wife, from the way in which she had seen him put Mrs. Whately' (the object, all his life, of his strongest affection) 'into a carriage.'\*

In 1805 he entered Oriel College, Oxford. That college was then, and for some years afterwards, the most distinguished in the whole University. Dr. Copleston, afterwards Dean of Chester and Bishop of Llandaff, who was a college tutor at Oriel at the time of his entrance, and subsequently became Provost, was one of those who most eminently contributed to raise the character of his college to the height it retained during the early part of this century.

To Richard Whately, whose intellectual life had hitherto been so entirely solitary, the lectures and converse of Dr. Copleston were like a new spring of life. For the first time he found himself brought into immediate communication with one who could enter into his aspirations, and draw out the latent powers of his mind. And under that new and genial influence the young student's powers expanded like a plant in sunshine. Often has he described in after-life those lectures which were to form the turning-point in his intellectual career. As Copleston's penetrating eye glanced round the lecture-room in search of an answering and understanding look, it rested with satisfaction on the one pupil who was always sure to be eagerly

drinking in his every word. The Archbishop often dwelt on the thrill of pleasure with which he heard the first words of calm discriminating commendation of his theme from his tutor's lips: 'That is well, Mr. Whately; I see you understand it.'

\*The influence which these two men reciprocally exercised on each other was very great, and to a certain extent coloured the subsequent lives of both. Bishop Copleston was more the man of the world of the two. But in him, under a polished and somewhat artificial scholarlike exterior, and an appearance of even overstrained caution, there lurked not only much energy of mind and precision of judgment, but a strong tendency to liberalism in Church and State, and superiority to ordinary fears and prejudices. It was in this direction that he especially trained Whately's character; while he learnt to admire, if too staid to imitate, the uncompromising boldness and thorough freedom from partisanship of the younger man. But the ideas of both were too uncongenial with those which prevailed among the large majority of Oxford residents at the time to be in favour; and 'Oriental' in general, with its pretensions to dissect, by searching logic, the preconceived notions of the little world around it, was not popular. The great dispenser of patronage in those days, Lord Liverpool, was thought to have been prejudiced against Copleston by Oxford advisers. And Whately, whose disposition was always a little too ready to lend itself to impressions of injustice done to a friend, seems early in life to have regarded his tutor as something of a martyr.\*

His constitutional tendency was to indolence; but this was conquered by his earnest desire to profit by what he was learning. He often remarked in after-years that the mere thirst for knowledge might not have been in itself

sufficient to accomplish this ; but his anxious wish to be independent, and no longer a burden on his widowed mother, was a stimulus to him to advance in those studies which alone held out to him a prospect of attaining his object. And manfully and resolutely he set himself to work.

Though naturally one who shook off sleep with difficulty, it was his college habit to arouse himself by the help of an alarum in his room, at five o'clock, summer and winter, light his own fire, and study for two hours or more ; then sally forth for an early walk, from which he returned in time to meet the band of late risers hurrying from their beds to the eight-o'clock chapel. He has described, in his 'Annotations on Bacon,' the results of the observations of natural phenomena which he made in these early morning walks ; and also his experience as a student with respect to hours. He found it best to pursue the early-rising plan when engaged only in the acquirement of knowledge ; but whenever he had to compose a theme or essay, he found his ideas did not flow as freely in the morning as at night ; he therefore changed his habits, and sat up at night while occupied in any original work.

His intercourse with his tutor, Copleston, soon ripened into a steady and solid friendship, which lasted till death dissolved it. It was in their long walks together, in the woods and meadows near Oxford, that they discussed and worked out such subjects as form much of the ground-work of the 'Logic.'

In 1809 he commenced a plan which was continued up to within a few months of his death,—viz., that of noting down his thoughts in a Commonplace Book. A considerable portion of this has now been brought before the public. It is interesting to see his early aspirations in the first pages, written in a youthful and unformed hand.

They can best be described by quoting his own words :—  
‘ When I consider the progress I have made in the improvement of my mind since I have been at college, I cannot help thinking that by perseverance almost any one may do more than at first sight appears possible ; and I regret more than ever the time I formerly lost. But the past cannot be recalled ; the future is in my power, and I resolve, through God’s help, to make the best use of it ; and though I am very likely to fail of my main object, I shall at least satisfy my conscience by doing my best. When I call to mind the independent spirit and thirst for improvement which I admired in my beloved tutor Copleston, I am stimulated to double exertions, that I may be enabled, as in other things, so in this, to imitate his virtues ; and as the improvement of my mind is one of my objects, though not the principal one, I have begun the plan recommended by Miss E. Smith,<sup>1</sup> of keeping a register of my thoughts.’

In this preface, if so we may call it, to all his subsequent literary labours, we catch a glimpse of those religious sentiments to which the reserve of his character and habits rarely permitted an expression ; and the spirit in which he began this, which many would have considered a purely secular work, is shown further by the full-length quotation of the last verse of Psalm xix. in the fly-leaf of his first notebook : ‘ Let the words of my mouth, and the meditations of my heart, be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord, my strength, and my redeemer ! ’

The details of this interesting period of his life are necessarily few and scanty ; and they must be chiefly

<sup>1</sup> He alludes to a little volume of the ‘ Remains of Elizabeth Smith,’ published by Miss Bowdler, and giving an interesting account of the efforts at self-improvement under difficulties of a young person of very remarkable powers.

drawn from recollections of his conversation in later life, and from the pages of his Commonplace Book.

The time now came for him to take his degree. He went up for honours in 1808, and took a double second-class. It has been suggested that his failure to obtain a first-class in classics was owing to the circumstance that the examiners at that time were inclined to lay more stress on the graces of language and proficiency in the minute points of elegant scholarship than on the branches in which he more peculiarly excelled. But, although a very good scholar, he was never what, in the estimation of fastidious Oxonians, is accounted an accomplished one.

The first step which gave him a sense of conscious power, was his gaining the prize for the English Essay. The subject was the comparative excellence of the ancients and moderns, and he often recurred to this early success as one of the turning-points in his life. The next step forward was his attainment of his fellowship, which took place in 1811, when he was elected Fellow of Oriel. No advancement in later life ever seems to have given him such intense and heartfelt pleasure as this, the first well-earned reward of his labours. It enabled him to realise his long-cherished wish of earning his bread independently.

In 1812 he took his degree as Master of Arts, and continued to reside at Oxford as a private tutor.

The incident which led to his introduction to one of his most intimate friends, gives a strong proof of the estimation in which he was generally held in that capacity.

An old and valued friend of his, the late Mr. Hardcastle, requested him to undertake the tuition of a young man of great promise, who had come up to the University with every expectation of honours, but had failed to answer a question in his divinity examination in the very

words of the Catechism. The examiner remarked, 'Why, sir, a child of ten years old could answer that!' 'So could I, sir,' replied the young student, 'when *I* was ten years old!' But the sharp repartee did not save him from being plucked. Both he and his family were naturally much mortified; but being of a nature not easily crushed, the disappointment, which might have been hurtful to many, acted rather as a stimulus on him; he resolved he would retrieve his injured reputation, and for this it was important to secure a first-rate private tutor. Through their common friend, Mr. Hardcastle, he was introduced to Mr. Whately, and shortly after wrote home to his father—'I have got Whately for my private tutor, and I will have the first-class next term.' He succeeded, and this was the commencement of a friendship between Richard Whately and Nassau William Senior which lasted through their lives. The younger friend survived his former tutor but a few months.

In the long vacations he usually went, with a select party of his pupils, to read in some picturesque part of England; continental travelling being then shut out, owing to the war. Some survive who look back with undying interest and pleasure to those summer sojourns, in which their teacher became also their companion, and in the midst of the sports in which he delighted and excelled—for he was a first-rate shot and fisherman—would pour forth from the rich stores of his own mind treasures of wit and wisdom which were long remembered by his hearers.<sup>1</sup> A few reminiscences of these days may be given in the words of one of these early pupils and friends, Sherlock

<sup>1</sup> There are still—or were until very lately—some few who remembered Mr. Whately in his early Oxford days, under the sobriquet of the 'White Bear,' derived from a white hat, rough white coat, and huge white dog, which were then his principal outward marks.

Willis, Esq., first introduced to him through the means of the Rev. T. Parsons, who, as already mentioned, was through life his dear and valued friend.

‘I first knew Whately,’ writes this early friend, ‘when with Mr. Parsons, at Redlands, near Bristol, as a private pupil. Whately had then just taken his degree at Oriel. Parsons had been a fellow of Oriel and an old friend and schoolfellow of Whately’s. Being a West Indian, many of his friends were from thence. One of these of the name of Rowe, Hinds, and myself, became amongst Whately’s most intimate friends at college, in consequence of his having known us at his friend Parsons’s. He was always original both in manners and dress, and showed even then his high order of intellect.

‘Two years after I entered Oxford, when I began to read steadily, he received me as a regular private pupil, and six months afterwards we all went together to Coniston—his friends Hinds and Boulton, and myself. This was in 1814. We were all reading together—we formed a kind of republic—Whately was always ready to give us advice or information for our reading when called upon. Our usual manner of life was to rise at five in the morning, breakfast early, dine at two, read “Terence” from half-past two to three or so, and then go out on excursions,—boating, fishing, or walking up the fells. There was a lady in the neighbourhood, whose daughter had written a book in four volumes, which she lent the party; each took a volume and read it up, so that when they were in company with the lady, and the book was under discussion, it was agreed that the one whose volume was being discussed should undertake the answers!

‘Whately insisted on our constantly conversing in Latin, to give familiarity with the language, and very amusing

were the expressions used: "Porridge juglandes, quæso," for "hand the walnuts." "Jam lucet sol super cacumina montium" was the call to summon us to rise in the morning.

'He was always full of humour, and had a strong sense of the ludicrous. One day he and I wanted to go out fishing; we went down to the lake, and found our boat afloat. This annoyed him, and I waded into the water and brought it up, upon which we got in and went on our way fishing; his way of repaying me (for repay me he did) was by giving me a lecture on "Aristotle"—a tolerably large compensation for a wetting! As we were fishing in the boat, a man came up and asked to be taken in, to which we agreed. The man was fishing from one end of the boat, and we from the other. He caught nothing; we did, as fast as we could throw in the line. We were, as usual, speaking in Latin. The man expressed his surprise that he could not catch as we did. "Why," said Whately, "you should talk Latin to them as we do!" The fact was that there was a shoal which did not reach to his end of the boat.'

\*Whately's close and sympathetic familiarity with the writings of Aristotle has been already mentioned. In point of fact, he was perhaps the leader among those who rendered the ethics and rhetoric of the Stagyræite for many years the leading class-book of his University, and who studied to unite them, by comparison and analysis, with all that they esteemed most valuable in modern philosophy. For the enthusiastic and exclusive Aristotelian tendency of Oxford minds, for a whole generation after his introduction to tutorial life, no man was so responsible as Whately.\*

With Plato's intellectual peculiarities, on the other

hand, he had little sympathy. The cast of his own mind was as unsuited to the master as it was in harmony with the pupil.

He was ordained deacon in the year 1814, and preached his first sermon at Knowle in Warwickshire. On this occasion his habits of abstraction caused him to commit a characteristic blunder; he forgot to write down his text, and when he had entered the pulpit, was obliged to communicate with the clerk to procure it.

It might be supposed, from the natural shyness of his disposition, that on first appearing in the pulpit he would have been painfully conscious; but the deep and solemn sense of the message he had to deliver was an effectual safeguard against this tendency. On a friend asking him if he did not feel very nervous on first reading and preaching in public, he replied, that he *dared* not; to think of himself at such a time was, in his eyes, not only a *weakness* but a *sin*.

Another lively picture of this part of his college life, during the period between 1811 and 1815, is given in the reminiscences of Bishop Hinds. The traits cited of him, though some of them may appear trivial, are so strikingly indicative of his character that we cannot withhold them. Bishop Hinds writes:—

‘I went from school to Oxford in November 1811; it having been previously arranged that Whately was to be my private tutor. He was, at that time, still a B.A. and in lodgings. There I received my first lecture. His apartment was a small one, and the little room in it much reduced by an enormous sofa, on which I found him stretched at length, with a pipe in his mouth, the atmosphere becoming denser and denser as he puffed. Not being accustomed to smoking, my eyes burned and my head was affected. All, however, was soon forgotten in the interest of the interview.

There was no ostentatious display of talent and acquirement. Never did tutor in his teaching seem to think so little of himself, and to be so thoroughly engrossed with making his pupil comprehend what he taught. As was his custom, he often digressed from the lecture proper into some other topic, but was always instructive and entertaining. We immediately took to one another : I parted from him dazzled and fascinated.

‘I was soon invited to join him in his early morning walks. His custom was to start soon after five o’clock, returning, generally, in time for eight-o’clock chapel. In these rambles he was glorious. Every object was a text. It may be literally recorded of him that “he spake of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon even unto the hyssop that springeth out of the wall ; also of beasts, and of fowl, and of creeping things, and of fishes ;” all taking their turn with classical or modern literature, religion, philosophy, and what not besides? *Nihil non tetigit, nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*

‘One peculiarity I used to note ; he ever quitted the beaten tracks ; and we were sure, sooner or later, to have a hedge or ditch to scramble through, or swampy ground to tread delicately over, without any apparent reason, except his perverse propensity for *avia loca, nullius ante trita solo.*

‘On one of these occasions we were joined by another of his pupils, a schoolfellow of mine, long since dead—an out-and-out specimen of Milsom Street and the Pump Room, Bath, as Bath was in those days ; exquisitely neat in his person, and scrupulous about soiling the very soles of his boots—*shoes* I ought to say, for at that time they were generally worn in Oxford. We got on without any serious discomfort to him, until we came upon a stream of water. Whately turning to him said, “What shall we do

now?" He, no more dreaming of his tutor really fording the stream than of his miraculously drying it up, replied jocularly, "If you will go through, I will follow." In plunged Whately; but looking back, and seeing H. R. gaping at him, without the remotest intention of following him, he returned, and exclaiming, "You said you would follow me, and follow me you shall," dragged him bodily through the water. He was a good-natured fellow, and joined in the hearty laugh at his expense, but never in another cross-country walk.

'We passed the Christmas vacation of 1812, or part of it, together at Ramsgate. He brought with him his gun and a dog. Within-doors I went over with him the first six books of Euclid. His mode of teaching it was, I recollect, to give me the Propositions and leave me to puzzle them out without book or other assistance, which was only given when I had tried and failed to do so. Out-of-doors he always carried his gun, and occasionally brought down a bird. His chief sport was among the crows, a species, if I recollect aright, remarkable for having some white feathers. One morning he shot an unusually plump one. "This," said he, "will make a capital supper for Bishop"—that, I think, was the name of his dog. Accordingly he brought the crow home, and handed it to the landlady, with instructions as to how it was to be dressed for doggy. In due time it made its appearance, looking, I must confess, anything but tempting for a human stomach; and the dog seemed to think it as little suited to canine nature, for he turned his back on it disdainfully, and slunk into a corner. Whately endeavoured to coax him into an appetite for it, and, from coaxing, changed his tone to that of remonstrance and rebuke. All to no purpose. It now became a contest between the will of the master and that of the animal. Whately resolved to carry his point. The

dish was put away until the following day. Morning, noon and night the same scene recurred; the more Whately laboured to induce Bishop, the more Bishop seemed determined not to yield, and the dish was remanded to yet another day. On the following morning, when the dog was called, and, as before, shown the boiled crow, he paused for some minutes, eyed it with a look which deserved to be immortalised by Landseer, uttered a sharp yelp, and, pouncing on the hateful mess, devoured it as ferociously as ever New Zealander did the flesh of his enemy, Whately all the while shouting, "Good dog, good dog!" The victory was gained, but there was no more crow-cooking.

‘When Whately was reading for the Oriel fellowship, he spent a long vacation at Shanklin, in the Isle of Wight. It was before I became acquainted with him; but he has often told me that whilst there he made two days out of one. His method was to rise about three o’clock in the morning, and conclude his first day at noon. He then undressed, drew his bedroom curtains, went to bed, and slept for two or three hours. Then began his second day, which ended at ten at night. For all working purposes he found time doubled; the noon siesta doing for him what night usually does, in breaking the current of active life and preparing us for fresh exertion.

‘Whately and I started from Oxford, early one morning in the winter of 1813, by a Birmingham coach, to visit our friends the Boultones at Springfield. Our travelling companions, inside the coach, were two strangers, a man and a woman. The man was full of fun and frolic, and for some time made himself merry at the expense of the woman, having detected her in the act of slyly putting to her lips a bottle of some comforting drink with which she had provided herself. From her he turned upon Whately, observing, as the daylight increased, that he had the

appearance of being clerical or academical. "I suppose, sir," said he, "that you are one of the gentlemen who teach at Oxford?" Whately nodded assent. "I don't care," he continued, "who knows it, but I am a Catholic." No reply. "Well, sir, I'll tell you what my religious principle is. My wife is one of you, and I have a servant who is a Dissenter. When Sunday comes round, I see that my wife goes to her place of worship, my servant to hers, and I go to mine. Is not that the right religious principle?"

*Whately* : "Yes; but I do not mean by that that you are right in being a Roman Catholic."

*Stranger* : "Ay, you don't like our praying to the Virgin Mary and to the saints."

*Whately* : "That is one thing; but I must own that there is something to be said for your doing so."

*Stranger* : "To be sure there is."

*Whately* : "You, I guess, are a farmer?"

*Stranger* : "Yes, sir, and no farm in better order than mine in all Oxfordshire."

*Whately* : "If your lease was nearly run out, and you wanted to have it renewed on good terms, I dare say you would ask any friend of your landlord, any of his family, or even his servants, anyone in short, to say a good word for you?"

*Stranger* : "You have hit it; our praying to the Virgin and to the saints to intercede for us is the same thing—it is but natural and reasonable."

*Whately* : "Now, suppose your landlord had one only son—a favourite—and he gave out that whoever expected any favour from him, must ask that son, and no one else, to intercede for him, what then?"

*Stranger* : "Oh! that would alter the case; but what do you mean by that?"

*Whately* : "I mean that God has declared to us, by

His Word, the Bible, that there is *one* Mediator between God and man—the man Christ Jesus.”

*Stranger* : “ And is that in the Bible ? ”

*Whately* : “ It is ; and when you go home, if you have a Bible, you may look into it yourself and see.”

‘ After a pause, the farmer said, “ Well, sir, I’ll think over that ; but ”—and on the controversy travelled through the prominent differences between us and the Roman Catholics, the farmer, on each successive defeat, endeavouring to make up for being driven from one position by falling back on another which he presumed must be more tenable.

‘ This discussion lasted until we were near Banbury, where we parted company. The farmer, on quitting, having noticed that Whately had a fowling-piece with him, held out his hand to him, and said, “ I am so-and-so, and live at such-and-such a place, not far from this ; if you will come and spend a few days with me, I will get you some capital shooting, and I’ll be right glad to see you. Now you’ll come, won’t you ? ”

‘ As they never met again, Whately never knew whether his arguments made any permanent impression on the man. Perhaps he does now, and may be rejoicing over an ingathering from seed thus scattered, and left for God to give it increase.

‘ While on a visit to his friend Parsons, at Redland, near Bristol, they attended divine service one Sunday at a church hard by. On the clergyman beginning the prayers, Whately was seized with one of those strange fancies that intrude sometimes on one’s most serious and solemn moments. He thought, “ What if that clergyman were suddenly to drop dead ? What would take place ? ” In the midst of this day dream, the clergyman did actually drop, and was carried out of the church. “ I hardly knew,” said

Whately, on relating the occurrence, "whether I was awake or asleep." He was soon roused, however, by some one from the vestry, who reported that the clergyman was too ill to return, and requested that he or Parsons would undertake the service. It was arranged that Parsons should occupy the desk, and that a messenger should be despatched to his house for some sermons of Whately's, which he had, as he supposed, left in an open drawer. The service proceeded, drew near to a close, and no sermons arrived. At the last moment the messenger returned to say that they were not to be found. Whately, nevertheless, mounted the pulpit, made some remarks on the accident that gave occasion to his being there, apologised to the congregation for having no sermon, and hoped that they would be content with his doing for them what he was in the habit of doing for his own people—reading a chapter from the Bible, and explaining it as he went on. This he did, no doubt much to their instruction and edification, besides saving the Church from the reproach of one of its congregations being dismissed without a word of exhortation, neither of two clergymen present being able to give it.

'Among the incidents in my intercourse with him which I most regret having allowed to pass into oblivion, except as to their general impression on me, were my evenings with him after he had been in Oriel Common Room.<sup>1</sup> The discussions which used to take place, on a wide range of subjects, were most enlightening, and he used to detail them to me nearly verbatim. Would that I could recall some of them! That Common Room

<sup>1</sup> 'It is curious' (says Dean Stanley, in his 'Life of Arnold') 'to observe the list which when the youthful scholar of Corpus, Arnold, was added to it (he was elected Fellow of Oriel in 1815) contained the names of Copleston, Davison, Whately, Keble, Hawkins, and, shortly after he left it (1820) those of Newman and Pusey.'

was to him not a mere place of resort for relaxation and recreation, but a school for sharpening his argumentative powers, and for training him to make that use of them in his social intercourse, in Parliament, and in other public assemblies, which was so striking and effective. It is hardly too much to say, that he was not less indebted to Oriel Common Room than to the college lectures in the earlier portion of his college life.'

\*The Archbishop's principal friends, both of the Oriel Common Room and others, will be gradually introduced to the reader in this correspondence. Newman, Hinds, Baden Powell, Pope (his brother-in-law), and the Rev. J. Woodgate (now Rector of Belbroughton), may be named as chief among those who formed his sect or 'following,' if such it may be termed, during his residence at Oxford. But Whately was never a popular man, in the ordinary sense of the word. His opinions clashed too decidedly with those which prevailed in the Oxford society of his day to render him so in general life. And in private, though some loved him, many were deterred from attempting any close intimacy with him by his roughness of manner, and the disdain which he was commonly supposed to entertain for the common herd of thinkers. All the while, his attachment to his own particular set—to those few who were his real intimates—was almost feminine in its tenderness, and most constant in its durability. Any friend of Whately's was (in his view) something sacred—some one whose views, and writings, and character were to be defended against all-comers, and at all hazards. And no one can have failed to remark in his writings, traces of that curious self-delusion which sometimes affects men of strong minds and strong affections, and who are by nature teachers rather than readers and listeners. Judgments and sentiments which he had

himself instilled into his sectaries, when reproduced by them, struck him as novelties ; and he may frequently be caught quoting, with much approbation, expressions of this or that follower, which in truth are mere 'Whateleiana,' consciously or unconsciously borrowed from him.\*

In 1815 he made his first journey abroad, under circumstances very unlike those which mark the foreign excursions of most young men. His expedition was made with no view to personal gratification or curiosity, but entirely for the sake of another. His fourth sister, afterwards Lady Barry, who had long been in precarious health, had just received the fiat from her physician that she must pass the ensuing cold season confined to her apartment. On mentioning this to her brother, he hastened to ascertain from her medical adviser if a winter in Portugal would be a desirable alternative, and on receiving an affirmative answer, he at once proposed escorting her and another sister to Oporto. This offer involved no small self-denial, as it was made in uncertainty as to whether he could venture to leave his sisters abroad ; and in the event of his being obliged to remain with them, a whole year of his college work was sacrificed. No personal gratification could to him have made up for such a loss ; and foreign travel did not present the same attraction for him that it does for most young men.

It was a curious feature in his character, that though an unwearied observer of nature, with a lively interest in national peculiarities, and a correct appreciation of fine scenery, travelling was in general positively disagreeable to him. To his concentrative mind, the attention to small details was most annoying ; and to one whose nature craved constant and steady work, weeks spent in moving about and sight-seeing were irksome. His mind turned with longing to his regular

pursuits; and though for a definite object he would shrink from no fatigue or difficulty, he would never have felt it worth while going far out of his way to see the grandest scene or most curious sight, much as he might enjoy it if it came into the ordinary course of his life. And for the treasures of art, antiquity, curious old cities, and fine buildings, he had little or no taste. Pictures gave him the liveliest pleasure, if the subject interested him, and the design seemed well carried out; but not otherwise. He never forgot a picture which really illustrated a subject he thought interesting and suitable; sketches of costumes of different countries, illustrations of savage life, of hunting, or of striking scenes in history or fiction, delighted him. When on the Continent, many years later, he turned with indifference and almost distaste from the masterpieces of Raphael, Correggio, and other old masters. Madonnas and Holy Families seemed to him only misrepresentations of Scripture, whose beauty of execution could not atone for the false ideas conveyed; but he was enchained by a picture he saw at Frankfort, in 1846, of John Huss before the Council of Trent, and recurred to it repeatedly in after-years. Architecture was a 'dead letter' to him; and for antiquities, as such, he had little or no taste.

It may therefore easily be imagined, that the journey thus undertaken was one which involved even more self-sacrifice in him than to most others. In those days a journey to Portugal was no easy matter. By some inadvertency the vessel which sailed direct for Oporto periodically was missed, and they were compelled to take places in a ship bound for Lisbon. Here they delayed no longer than was needful for rest; and it is characteristic of the turn of mind referred to, that he made no attempt to visit the already renowned beauties of Cintra.

The journey from Lisbon had to be performed across the country, on roads betokening a very low state of civilisation, and at a time when the recent Peninsular war had left everything in confusion. After a slow and fatiguing journey Oporto was reached; and there they found some friends settled, under whose protection Mr. Whately was enabled to leave his sisters, and, after a few days, to return by the next packet to his college duties.

His recollections, however, of this short trip were singularly full and vivid; and often, in later life, he would recur to peculiarities he had remarked in the country, people, customs, and language. Nothing escaped him. He learned enough of the language to make himself understood in common things, and forty years afterwards would remember and remark on Portuguese words as if he had heard them but yesterday. He was accustomed to speak of himself as a bad linguist, and the learning of languages for the mere sake of learning was not a pursuit to which he was much inclined; but the general principles of language, and everything connected with philological research, were always interesting to him. French was the only modern language he ever made himself master of; he acquired it at school, persisting, in spite of the ridicule of his companions, in conversing in French with the French master. In after-life he had much occasional intercourse with foreigners, and although he always seemed to feel painfully hampered by a language of which he did not possess the full command he had of his own, still those who conversed with him were often struck with the accuracy and fluency of his French conversation.

On his return from Portugal, in the autumn of 1815, he gladly returned to the scenes and the sphere of work

which were so congenial to him; and the next five or six years were spent entirely in his employments as a tutor, both in a private and public capacity, varied only by occasional excursions during the long vacations.

Teaching was indeed the occupation most peculiarly suited to his powers and tastes. He had a remarkable faculty of drawing out the mind of the learner, by leading him step by step, and obliging him to think for himself. He used to say that he believed himself to be one of the few teachers who could train a young person of retentive memory for words, without spoiling him. The temptation to the student in such cases, is to rehearse by rote the rules or facts he has learned, without exercising his powers of thought; while one whose powers of recollection were less perfect, would be forced to reflect and consider what was *likely* to be written or said on such or such a point by the writer, and thus to learn more intelligently and less mechanically. The cure for this tendency, in young persons who learned quickly by rote, he effected by asking them questions substantially the same as those in the textbook, but which they must answer in their own words, making them draw conclusions from axioms already laid down. In this manner he was able successfully to teach mathematics to many who had been apparently unable to master the first principles, and often to ground them in the Elements of Euclid better than some mathematicians whose actual attainments were far beyond his own.

Both in this branch and in logic, as in all other studies, he always commenced analytically and ended synthetically—first drawing out the mind of the learner by making him give the *substance* of the right answer, and then requiring the exact technical form of it in words. In later life he loved to propose logical puzzles for the young

persons around him, to whom he would give a breakfast-table lecture, and make them dissect some inconclusive piece of reasoning, or solve some problem.

One of the few survivors among his near connexions records some pleasing reminiscences of his manner of teaching in private. 'I can speak,' she writes, 'to his kind and patient way of instructing me when a girl, always saying, "Do not adopt my opinions because they *are mine*, but judge for yourself;" of his pleasant, playful way of correcting foibles. I used to scribble sadly as a girl, and he wrote me a letter, beginning in a clear hand, "My dear ——, and then a page of scribble impossible to read; ending with, "Now you see the evil of writing unintelligibly." He cured me of shyness too. "You are shy," he would say, "because you are thinking of the impression you are making. Think only of the pleasure you can give to others, and not of yourself."'

He possessed a remarkable power of discriminating and analysing the characters of those with whom he was brought into contact as teacher. His own reminiscences, given in conversation in later life, of these early Oxford experiences among his pupils, were both interesting and instructive; and those who listened to him could scarcely fail of retaining vivid mental pictures of the groups he sketched, though the individuals described were scarcely known to them by name. Among the rest stands out, in strong relief, the contrast drawn between two in particular—one with a calm and self-possessed exterior, concealing an almost morbid diffidence and self-distrust; the other shy and timid in company, yet secretly inclined to overrate his powers. I think it was the former of these two, whom he persuaded, with some difficulty, to write an essay for a prize. For some time the young student hung back, declaring he could never even hope

to pass muster. His tutor at last induced him by earnest persuasion, out of personal compliance with a friend's request, to begin. After writing a few pages, the courage of the candidate failed; he sent them to his tutor with a note, declaring he had made the attempt to please him, and sent what he had done to prove the impossibility of his succeeding. Mr. Whately at once perceived that the commencement was a promising one, and indicated talents which would command success; knowing therefore the character he had to deal with, he wrote on the margin, 'Go on as you have begun, and you will get the prize.' He did so, succeeded, and felt that it was a step which gave the turning-point to his life.

Mr. Whately took, indeed, a peculiar delight in encouraging diffident and desponding characters. He used to say that in England, over-diffidence was really a commoner defect than excessive self-esteem.

Yet he was resolutely firm when occasion called for it. In one case it was necessary a student should be expelled for glaring misconduct. He was a man of uncommon talent, and even genius, and possessed singular powers of persuasion. He wrote a long, eloquent, and touching letter to Mr. Whately, entreating him and the other college officers to reconsider their decision. 'I did not venture a second glance at the letter,' said my father, in speaking of the incident many years later; 'I knew we had decided rightly, and that we *ought* not to yield; but the power of that letter was such that I could not trust myself with a second reading, lest I should be softened in spite of my better judgment; so I threw it into the fire.'

This was a case in which any concession would have injured the character of the college, and been hurtful to the principles of morality and virtue; but Dr. Whately, as Principal of Alban Hall, some years later, was a merciful

though a strict head of a house. ‘I pardon this as a first offence,’ he would sometimes say, after some escapade of an undergraduate, ‘and I do not wish to remember it. I will not, unless *you force me to do so*. But recollect, if that you commit a second, I must remember the first.’

Another reminiscence of a different kind we may quote. He had an early college-friend, whose character he used to describe as a peculiarly attractive union of perfect sweetness of temper with a vehement enthusiasm, which is more frequently found combined with some heat and irritability. ‘He was like a south-west wind,’ he would say, ‘strong, but mild. Once he was bursting forth into a vehement eulogy of the institution of Trial by Jury. I maintained, on the opposite side, that England was not ripe for it when first introduced, and is scarcely fit for it yet. He seized a glass of wine, and, falling on his knees, drank the health of the founder of the institution; I immediately took up a glass of water and, turning my back to the table, drank the health, as if in mockery, to the great amusement of all present.’

His energy and love of remedying abuses were manifested on many occasions which would generally be regarded as trifling. He used to relate that when travelling by stage-coach, as he did two or three times a year, between Oxford and Bath, the coachman was in the habit of putting up half-way at an inn of very inferior pretensions, whose landlord and attendants, counting on the custom of the stage-coach as secure, made it their chief object to delay the breakfast or luncheon till the passengers were compelled to resume their journey without tasting the meal they had paid for. ‘I determined at last,’ he said, ‘that I would not suffer this. As soon as the coach stopped to change horses, I ran across to a small

inn on the opposite side, and engaged the people to prepare some refreshment as quickly as possible. Seeing that the change might benefit them, they were wonderfully prompt. Next time we passed I spoke of this to my companions, and persuaded one or two to come with me and get breakfast where it could be had in time. Each journey brought more and more of the passengers to my side, and at last, one memorable day, the whole party of travellers, inside and outside, repaired to the *opposition* inn. The victory was gained, the coach thenceforth put up there, and the rival house was effectually put down.'

He was fond of the outside of a coach, and conversed freely with all he met, often repeating amusing incidents of the old travelling days. Most of his friends will remember the stage-coach guard, who having been in the East or West Indies (I forget which), and also being possessed of some knowledge of chemistry, enjoyed a delightful sense of his superiority, of which he made the most, by parading before those whom he met his knowledge of whichever branch he found them deficient in. He poured forth the stores of his erudition to his fellow traveller, who let him go on, till at last, in a paroxysm of self-complacency, he exclaimed, 'Sir, I knows the natur of all things as is in the world!'

The earliest letter before the editor was written in the year 1818, to his friend Mr. Senior :—

' April 15, 1818.

' My dear Senior,—There is one circumstance I omitted to mention in my last letter, which is not a little interesting to me—your brother's book,<sup>1</sup> which I shall be very

<sup>1</sup> An account of the state of Jamaica at that time, which the writer, who had served there long with his regiment, had thrown into the shape of a tale.

glad to hear of as in progress. The mere circumstance that it is, as I think, likely to have a great run, is, in itself, of no great consequence; but in combination with its tendency to do good, is of the highest. I for my part, indeed, am very much of Bacon's opinion, who seems to doubt whether there can be, properly speaking, any such thing as a useless truth: that, many might doubt, but their doubts could hardly extend to the present case, where the truth in question so obviously leads to practice. No detailed argument can be needed to show, that if Jamaica is a part of this empire, the state of it ought to be known; and that this is proportionally the more important if there be anything in it that calls loudly for amendment, and if ignorance and misapprehension generally prevail on the subject. To say nothing of celebrity, which I would never take for granted to be anyone's principal object, till I am compelled to do so, I do not see how anyone, who has a sense of duty, and who feels that his country has a demand on him for some duties, can fail to consider himself bound to do what tends to so great a public benefit. The only question is as to the mode; and I think the one proposed decidedly the best that could be adopted. It would be hardly possible in a description to collect and detail the many little matters to be noticed, so as to avoid a very uninteresting dryness; and a strictly correct narrative, which should distinguish in due order how each piece of information was acquired, would necessarily blend together matters of very various nature, and disjoin things nearly connected; so that the descriptions would be given piecemeal, and the whole would be insufferably tedious, and all merely for the sake of adhering to strict truth in a matter in which it is not of the smallest consequence,—viz., the adventures of an

individual ; for no one cares whether he and his exploits be real or fictitious, the object of curiosity being the state of things generally. With respect, indeed, to great public characters and political events, we wish to know what actually happens : with respect to private individuals and minor occurrences (though, taken collectively, these are of the higher importance), our curiosity is to know what sort of things happen. It is on this ground I have always defended the Waverley Novels ; and I do not see why the production in question should not possess a good deal of the same sort of interest which they have excited. I take for granted (which I may do at a venture, without paying your brother an ill compliment) that it will be far inferior to them in their incomparably picturesque descriptions ; but it will have, to counterbalance that, the advantage of being about the present, whereas they relate to the past. Think of the interest excited by the debates in the House of Commons, compared with that of the far more eloquent orations of Cicero and Demosthenes ! I will only add, that the earlier the work comes forward, the better ; not only because, “*cæteris paribus*,” now is always the best of times, but because the freshness of the events in the writer’s mind will much benefit the descriptions, and also because all that relates to Spanish America will daily lose interest if deferred.<sup>1</sup> I hope he will be careful to preserve poetical justice, as I suggested, by making his hero smart for his faults, which might be done by making them the cause of a voyage in which he should be captured, &c. The necessary indelicacy of some parts renders some morality the more indispensable.—Yours affectionately,

‘RD. WHATELY.’

<sup>1</sup> The book mentioned was published many years later, under the title of ‘Charles Vernon.’ It is referred to in a subsequent letter.

The following reminiscences from another of his early friends, the Rev. R. N. Boulton, addressed to the writer of this memoir, will throw further light on his character and early history: 'I regret,' he says, 'that I can give you no information as to the early part of your father's college life, as my acquaintance with him did not commence till after he had been elected a Fellow of Oriel, and taken his M.A. degree. He was the contemporary and great friend of my eldest brother at Oriel, and out of regard for him, when I went up to college, he took me by the hand, and was during my whole career at Oxford as an elder brother, friend, tutor—in a word, everything to me; and to him I always consider that I owe my chief success in life. I was in the habit of walking out into the country with him two or three times a week, and during these rambles I was made the recipient of many of his most original thoughts, preserved in his Commonplace Book. Well do I remember the shady bank in Bagley Wood, where he first read to me the draft of the "Historic Doubts."

'I left Oxford in 1819, and we rarely met till he returned there as Principal of St. Alban Hall. There from time to time I used to visit him, and during these visits had frequently cause to regret how very much the influence he might have exercised in the government of the University was lessened by his utter disregard of the customs and regulations of the place.

'On many a summer's evening did I walk with him in "beaver," as it was called, in Christchurch meadow, where every one was expected to appear in cap and gown, and where, to the horror of the "Dons," a crowd would be collected round him to witness the exploits of his dog "Sailor," a large spaniel whom he had taught to climb the high trees hanging over the Cherwell, from which he would

often drop into the river below ; and this curious exploit of his dog he continued to exhibit, in the face of sundry grave remonstrances. Nevertheless his influence for good in the University was very considerable, the result of his transcendent talents and uncompromising honesty. As a preacher in the University, his powers were fully appreciated, though his manner was far from attractive. Early attendance at the doors of the church on the days he preached was necessary to secure even a standing-place. . . .

‘ The way in which he would throw himself into the trifling amusements of society, was to me a very striking part of his character. During my residence at college we got up a chess-club, limited to ten members which met at each other’s rooms. He was a good player, and at and after the supper which followed the games, he was the life and soul of the party, first and foremost in the jokes and charades, and fun of all kinds ; and many of our best songs were supplied by him. He was no singer ; I never heard him attempt it. But the rule was that those who could not sing must compose a song.

‘ Several of the songs in his collection were composed for the club, and sung by myself.

‘ One scene is, and will ever be, from particular circumstances, very vividly before me. It was at the house of his great friend, Mr. B. of A. In the morning B——, Whately, and myself, had amused ourselves by lading a hole in the brook, for the sake of catching “ bullheads,” a small unsightly fish with which the brook abounded, and which were supposed to be very good. In the evening was a grand dinner—a magnificent turbot at one end of the table, and a dish of bullheads at the other, to which latter Whately most gallantly adhered. A certain lady, well-known for her propensity for setting people to-rights,

called out, "I can't think, Mr. Whately, how you can eat those ugly-looking fish, with such a magnificent turbot before you; they are so small!" He replied, without looking up from his plate, "If you had a whale on your plate, you must cut it in bits before you put it in your mouth!" I never shall forget how completely the whole party were electrified and delighted with the extinguisher put upon the good lady.'

It was at this time, when dining with a friend in Worcester College, that a trifling incident brought out one of his happiest *bons mots*. There were some medlars on the table, and his host regretted that he had in vain tried to procure also some *services* (*Pyrus domestica*, a fruit which grows wild in Kent and Sussex, and is there called 'checquers'). One of the company asked the difference between a 'service' and a 'meddler,' to which Mr. Whately replied, 'The same kind of difference as that between "officium" and "officiosus."'

## CHAPTER II.

1821—1828.

Commencement of his active literary career—A contributor to the ‘*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*’—His ‘*Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Buonaparte*’ and other works—His marriage—Appointed Bampton Lecturer—Removes to Halesworth—Illness of Mrs. Whately—Takes his D.D., and is appointed Principal of Alban Hall—Literary Society at Oxford—Testimony of Dr. Newman—of Dr. Mayo—instances of his powers of anecdote and repartee.

\*THIS period of Whately’s life was one of great and productive literary activity. He was a frequent contributor to some periodicals, and, in particular, to the ‘*Encyclopædia Metropolitana*:’ and in their pages some of the works by which he became in after-life most celebrated, first appeared.

In 1821, he edited Archbishop Wake’s ‘*Treatises on Predestination*,’ and in 1825 he published his essays ‘*On some of the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion* ;’ which, with the essays ‘*On some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*’ (1828), and on the ‘*Errors of Romanism Traced to their Origin in Human Nature*,’ form a series which has gone through many editions, which first established his reputation as a theologian, and which brought down on him no small share of his unpopularity with some classes in the Church.\*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This may be the most convenient place for noticing his celebrated little pamphlet of ‘*Historic Doubts respecting Napoleon Buonaparte*.’ ‘We had in our hand recently the thirteenth edition of it, published when the nephew of its hero had become President of the French Republic, and there may have been more since. It is directed against reasoners who argue thus (and

The materials for an account of his private life, during these years, are scanty. With a few early friends, not resident in Oxford, he appears to have maintained a full and frequent correspondence: but of these hardly any survive, and of the letters in their hands none seem to have been preserved. He never kept any kind of journal; he had special aversion to any work which he could not look forward to *completing*; and often said if he were forced to undertake a life-long diary he should wish his life over.

In the year 1820, being somewhat out of health, he was recommended to try the waters of Cheltenham, and went on a visit to his friend and pupil, Sherlock Willis; and thus naturally became acquainted with his friend's aunt, Mrs. Pope, widow of W. Pope, Esq., of Hillingdon, Middlesex, who was at that time also residing at Cheltenham with her daughters. To the third daughter, Elizabeth, he formed an attachment; and in the July of the following year was married to her at Cheltenham, by the Rev. Mr. Jervis, the rector. In what light he regarded his marriage as affecting the happiness of his life may be judged from a touching little memorandum in his Commonplace Book of that year—the only outlet he ever allowed himself (and that rarely) for his inmost feelings.

‘Happiness,’ he remarks, in an article dated the year before, ‘must, I conclude from conjecture, be a calm and

writers on Hume's side are constantly falling into the confusion, intentionally or casually), “Miracles cannot be believed on human testimony. But, in addition to this, the testimony on which you receive them is full of inconsistencies and absurdities.” The Whateleian answer is, “If no testimony will make miracles credible, then the character of the testimony is unimportant. But if it is important, then I will show you that a piece of well-known history—that of Napoleon, for instance—is as full of apparent inconsistencies and absurdities as the instances you cite from Scripture. And then, this task disposed of, we can attach ourselves more closely to the issue which is the kernel—Are miracles credible or no?”—*Edinburgh Review*, vol. cxxii.

serious feeling.' The following year he adds a note in Latin, 'I proved it, thank God! July 18, 1821.'

To speak of her who was now to be the companion of his life, is not easy for those who feel so deeply. To say that she was one fully able to appreciate his high qualities, is no more than truth, but falls far short of it. Those who remember the grace and dignity of character, the delicacy of mind, and sensitive refinement, which were united with her high powers of intellect and mental cultivation, and a thirst for knowledge seldom exceeded, will not fail to recall intercourse with one so gifted as a privilege: but many more still will remember, with deeper reverence, the moral and Christian graces which adorned her; the devoted unselfishness, the almost painfully sensitive conscientiousness, the gentle, tender, unwearied benevolence, and deep affections, all guided and regulated by the highest principles, springing from that living and loving faith in her Lord and Saviour, in the strength of which she lived and worked, and resting on which she died. What she was to the poor, the sick, the ignorant, and the erring; what her labours of love were in Dublin, where she carried out many blessed and Christian works which ended only with her life, many remain to testify; but all cannot be known till the great day when the sower and the reaper shall rejoice together.

Shortly after his marriage Dr. Whately settled in Oxford, where he took pupils; the following year he was appointed Bampton Lecturer, and his first published volume contains the course of lectures then delivered. The subject he chose was one which much occupied his mind through life—the evils and dangers of party spirit.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 'On the Use and Abuse of Party Feeling in Religion,' 1822. A fourth edition was published in 1859.

He often observed afterwards that in this choice of a subject he felt he was, as it were, 'breaking the bridge behind him,' and committing himself to a life-long combat against the evil he denounced. In the August of this year (1822), he removed to Halesworth in Suffolk, a living to which he had been presented by his uncle, Mr. Plumer, shortly before the death of the latter.

It had been anticipated by some, that one whose life had been passed almost exclusively in a college, would be hardly fitted for the very different sphere of a country parish. And certainly it could not fail to present many difficulties to one so little accustomed to that kind of work. But Mr. Whately did not easily yield to difficulties, small or great; whatever he undertook he set himself to master in right earnest, undeterred by discouragements or hindrances.

The task, even to one accustomed to parish work, must have been far from an easy one. The former incumbent had been an old and infirm man, whose reading and preaching were so nearly inaudible as to drive from the church the few who would have gone there in earnest. No effort had been made for the welfare of the people, secular or spiritual. But this part of my father's life-work can best be given in the words of her who was throughout it his able and unwearied helper.

'We had found the people,' my mother writes, 'in a state of heathenish ignorance from long neglect. We left them, I trust, in a very different condition, for we had carried with us youth and activity, as well as a deep sense of responsibility, to the task. An adult school, and a weekly lecture—which Mr. Whately gave at first in a private room, and then, when his hearers increased, in the church—were among the most apparent means by which the older portion of the parish were improved. And in the adult

school he was able to induce some of the tradespeople to assist. In every attempt at improvement, both spiritual and temporal, we were aided by two or three among the parishioners of the lower class: one, our valuable schoolmistress, daily carried on her labours of love, as soon as her school closed, among the sick, the sorrowful, and the sinning.

‘Mr. Whately was, I think, one of the first to set on foot that active and diligent preparation for Confirmation, by teaching and examination, which has since been generally adopted.’

To this it may be added, that it was a series of the weekly lectures alluded to, which were usually a kind of Scripture exposition, which formed the substance of the ‘Lectures on the Scripture Revelations of a Future State.’

But these labours of love were to be brought to a very speedy close. The damp climate of Halesworth made serious inroads on his wife’s constitution. Several times her life was in danger; and more than once her husband’s medical knowledge and singular presence of mind and promptness of action were called into play, both in her case and that of a sister who had come to nurse her, and been herself seized with typhus-fever of the most alarming kind.

Her life seemed to have been, humanly speaking, saved by her brother-in-law’s prompt decision and unwearied care.

In 1825<sup>1</sup> he took his degree as Doctor of Divinity, and was in the same year appointed, by Lord Grenville,

<sup>1</sup> The following is the list, taken from the Oxford Calendars, of Principals and Vice-Principals of Alban Hall for a few years from this time.

|               |          |              |
|---------------|----------|--------------|
| 1825.         | Elmsley. | Cramer, V.P. |
| 1826.         | Whately. | Newman, „    |
| 1827 to 1834. | Whately. | Hinds, „     |

Principal of Alban Hall. On this he removed with his family to Oxford, intending to spend the vacations at Halesworth ; but, after two or three years' trial, it became evident that even these occasional residences could only be continued at the risk of his wife's life. He therefore gave up residence, and, placing a valued and trusted curate in the rectory, contented himself with solitary visits to the parish three or four times a year, passing the long vacations with his family either at the sea, or at Tunbridge Wells, in the neighbourhood of his wife's relations, to whom he was strongly attached.

The new sphere of work at Alban Hall was apparently a more congenial one than that of Halesworth ; but the difficulties, in a different way, were quite as great. Alban Hall had gradually, either from neglect or mismanagement, become a kind of ' Botany Bay ' to the University—a place where students were sent who were considered too idle and dissipated to be received elsewhere. But the new Principal was not one to suffer this, and with his usual energetic resolution he set himself to remedy the evil. He ~~continued~~ continued to get rid of some of the useless members : and determined, first, never to receive into the Hall any who had been obliged to quit their college, and, secondly, to take his share in the lectures. And, lastly, he placed on a reasonable and moderate footing that scandal of many Oxford bodies, the ' Buttery ' establishment. These measures were quite sufficient to alter the character of the Hall, and eventually the members who resorted to it were so great that he built additional rooms, which were all occupied when he resigned.

When Dr. Hinds succeeded Mr. Newman as Vice-Principal, the character of the Hall had already been established ; but he remembers that a few of the old set still remained, whom they used to designate '*Albani Patres*'—

well-conducted and respectable, but beyond the usual age of undergraduates. In the year after his settlement at Alban Hall (1826) are dated the next letters to be presented to the reader. The first is to his friend Mr. Senior, on a subject which much occupied the minds of both, that of Political Economy. Both had done much to rescue this study from the undue prejudice with which it was generally regarded; and through life both laboured to bring the public mind to a clearer understanding of what it really was intended to teach, and of its importance to the general welfare of mankind :—

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

1826.

‘I have looked over your article, as well as the lectures,<sup>1</sup> and approve your design. You will see I have again mangled your first, though I think it much improved. As you will perhaps have several new hearers, it may be worth while to prefix a few sentences in vindication of the science, as that is what needs to be perpetually repeated in the most varied forms. It may be worth observing, that the pursuit of *private* wealth *can* be but harmless, and *may* degenerate into gross avarice, while that of public wealth is patriotism and charity; yet those who think the former allowable, and themselves practise it, raise a senseless outcry against the latter, like Seneca rolling in riches, and declaiming in favour of poverty; and you may congratulate your hearers (some of them young enough to need being reminded of it) that the abusive names lavished on the study afford a presumption that it is not to be assailed by argument. As there are also many of them clergymen, or clerical students, they

<sup>1</sup> Senior’s Lectures on Political Economy (to the professorship of which science at Oxford, founded by Mr. Drummond of Albury, he had just been appointed) were published from 1827 to 1831.

may be reminded, that to charge the science itself with every error, real or supposed, of every professor of it, is a procedure which they would not approve, if applied, as it easily may be, in the case of theology.'

The next is addressed to his old and valued friend, Mr. Philip Duncan, who, together with his elder brother, were through life among his highly-prized associates. It is a criticism of a series of logical lectures which had just appeared :—

‘ Oriel College, 1826.

‘It is said that Sir W. Raleigh gave his bailiff some potatoes, with directions to sow them, having heard of their being cultivated with advantage in America. At the time appointed in his memorandum-book, he sent him to collect the produce, and received a handful of the berries. “Ah, well,” he said, “I feared they would not do here; go, plough the field and sow wheat.” Now, if this ploughing had not casually turned up the potatoes, he might have written a treatise on the inexpediency of cultivating them. For “potatoes” read “logic,” and, *mutatis mutandis*, you have Dr. Jardine’s book.<sup>1</sup> He was doubtless right, on being appointed lecturer on a subject of which he was totally and profoundly ignorant, to teach something which he *did* understand; thence, according to the common plan of measuring other men’s corn by his own bushel, he concludes that what he cannot understand, or cannot teach, no one else can—that whatever plan he has hit upon was untried before, etc. etc. But he seems on the whole to have been a good tutor considering, and though his lectures were likely to

<sup>1</sup> ‘Jardine, *Outlines of Philosophical Education; illustrated by the Method of Teaching the Logic or First Class of Philosophy in the University of Glasgow*,’ 1818.

give his pupils an extensive superficial and vanity-feeding smattering, they had, probably, less of this fault than most of those in Scotland.'

It was in this year (1826) that the 'Logic' was published. This work had originally been written in articles for the 'Encyclopædia Metropolitana.' \*The task undertaken by the writer was one of no ordinary difficulty : it was not the originating of a new science, but the resuscitation of an old and half-defunct one. The study of logic, formerly pursued with great and creditable devotion, had, in latter years, fallen into disrepute among the more intellectual class in the University. It was pursued in the schools at Oxford merely by committing to heart the technical rules of the compendium of Dr. Aldrich. These were by no means without their utility as a tough mental exercise, and many an Oxonian might remember with gratitude the edge which it gave to his powers of reasoning, particularly if unacquainted with the more valuable discipline of mathematics. It was Whately's great and eminently successful effort to raise the study from this inferior condition to something approaching a scientific character.<sup>1</sup>

The 'Rhetoric' followed the 'Logic' in 1828. Like its predecessor, it had been originally written for the 'Encyclopædia.' The title, however Aristotelian, was not an attractive one to general readers, and he often regretted it in after-years, as giving an erroneous impression of the general scope and aim of the work ; which is, in fact, a series of lessons on the art of composition, and on the means to be employed for the arrangement of the matter of a discourse, whether written or spoken, so as to convince the understanding, persuade the will, and move the feelings.

<sup>1</sup> The present Oxford professor, Mr. Wall, is a pupil of Archbishop Whately.

Bishop Hinds has described the influence of the Oriel Common Room as a centre of literary and philosophical activity. Oxford, at that time, was distinguished by a constellation of talent and learning in various departments which has perhaps rarely been surpassed, if equalled, in any given time and place. Besides Copleston and Whately, the names of Newman, Pusey, Keble, Arnold, Hawkins, Hinds, Froude, Wilberforce, Blanco White, and others, appear in that brilliant assembly of gifted and eminent men. Most of these were on intimate terms with the Principal of Alban Hall; several were among his closest friends.\*

The 'Life' of Dr. Arnold sufficiently bears testimony to that pure, warm, and noble friendship which united these two eminent men till the death of the younger. The respective marriages of the two friends still further sealed and cemented this happy union; and the frequent interchanges of visits from one circle to the other—parents and children alike enjoying the free and unrestrained intercourse of domestic life together, according to their several ages and pursuits—must ever be held in tender and grateful remembrance by the scattered and bereaved survivors of that happy band of friends. In the letters from Rugby, frequent and affectionate mention is made of the pleasure conferred by Dr. Whately's visits, his lively interest in his friend's concerns, his tenderness for the children, and his varied and interesting conversation.

And Dr. Whately never failed to bear a hearty and earnest testimony to the merits of Arnold. At an early stage of his career, his friend had pointed out, to those judges who were discouraged by the crudities of Arnold's early essays, the 'great capability of growth' which he believed to be involved in these apparently unpromising

attempts. How truly and fully his prophecy was carried out, the world now knows.

It may appear strange that so few records remain of this friendship in the letters before us; but Dr. Arnold was not in the habit of preserving correspondence, and one only, of which a copy had been made, remains of Dr. Whately's many letters to this loved and valued friend.

With Mr. Keble much pleasant intercourse was enjoyed at Oxford; and it was during a visit paid by him to Halesworth that the manuscript poems which now form the 'Christian Year' were read by the writer to his host and hostess, who were among the earliest friends who suggested its publication.

The familiarity of Dr. Newman with Dr. Whately, connected as it is with points of so much interest in the lives of both, belongs to this period of their history. And the account of it is best given in the words of the great Oxford leader's own 'Apologia':—

'And now as to Dr. Whately. I owe him a great deal. He was a man of generous and warm heart. He was particularly loyal to his friends, and, to use the common phrase, "all his geese were swans." While I was still awkward and timid, in 1822, he took me by the hand, and acted the part to me of a gentle and encouraging instructor. He, emphatically, opened my mind, and taught me to think and to use my reason. . . . He had done his work towards me, or nearly so, when he had taught me to see with my own eyes, and to walk with my own feet. Not that I had not a good deal to learn from others still, but I influenced them as well as they me, and cooperated rather than merely concurred with them. As to Dr. Whately, his mind was too different from mine for us to remain long on one line. I recollect how dissatisfied he was with an article of mine in the "London Review,"

which Blanco White good-humouredly only called Platonic. When I was diverging from him (which he did not like), I thought of dedicating my first book to him, in words to the effect that he had not only taught me to think, but to think for myself. . . . I have always felt a real affection for what I must call his memory; for thenceforward he made himself dead to me. My reason told me that it was impossible that we could have got on together longer, yet I loved him too much to bid him farewell without pain. After a few years had passed, I began to believe that his influence on me, in a higher respect than intellectual advance (I will not say through his fault), had not been satisfactory. I believe that he has inserted sharp things in his later works about me; they have never come in my way, and I have not thought it necessary to seek out what would pain me so much in the reading.

‘What he did for me, in point of religious opinion, was first to teach me the existence of the Church as a substantive body or corporation; next to fix in me those anti-Erastian views of Church polity, which were one of the most prominent features of the Tractarian movement.’<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Newman proceeds to describe the effect produced on his mind by another little book which appeared about the same time (1826), and which public opinion has uniformly attributed to Whately: although, as he never avowed the authorship, the editor has felt some scruple as to mentioning it in connection with his name. This able tract (it has been said) is now out of date, because the opinions respecting the separation of Church from State, which it advocated, strange then to a Churchman, are now held by all but a few Churchmen:—

‘In the year 1826, in the course of a walk, Froude said much to me about a work then published, called “Letters on the Church, by an Episcopalian.” He said that it would make my blood boil. It was certainly a most powerful composition. One of our common friends told me, that after reading it he could not keep still, but went on walking up and down his room. It was ascribed at once to Whately. I gave eager expression to the contrary opinion, but I found the belief of Oxford in the affirmative to be too strong for me. Rightly or wrongly, I yielded to the general voice; and I have never heard,

It was at this period of his later Oxford career, perhaps the happiest of his life, that his remarkable conversational powers just began to be widely appreciated. The present opportunity may therefore serve for introducing a communication made to the writer of this memoir respecting him by one of his associates of early times, Dr. Mayo the physician :—

‘ In latter years our lives were thrown into different channels, and I saw very little of him ; but I will make a few remarks as to what my early acquaintance with his intellect suggested to me. His aptitude for inductive and deductive reasoning was nearly equal ; and he once told me that his mental powers in early life changed from the pure scientific type to that which his friends recognised in him afterwards—namely, the dealing with contingent matter.

‘ None who knew your father well could forget the pleasure which his society afforded, but life with him was a continued performance of a series of duties ; and it is possible that his powers, as a man of great wit and vivid imagination, may not have been sufficiently understood except by his immediate friends, though his wit often transfused itself into his public speeches. Witness his reply to some one in the House of Lords, who recom-

then or since, of any disclaimer of authorship on the part of Dr. Whately. The main positions of this able essay are these—first, that Church and State should be independent of each other : he speaks of the duty of protesting against the profanation of Christ’s kingdom, by that double usurpation, the interference of the Church in temporals, of the State in spirituals ; and, secondly, that the Church may justly and by right retain its property, though separated from the State. The author of this work, whoever he may be, argues out both these points with great force and ingenuity, and with a thoroughgoing vehemence, which perhaps we may refer to the circumstance that he wrote not in *propria personâ*, but in the professed character of a Scotch episcopalian. His work had a gradual but a deep effect on my mind.’<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, pp. 68-70.

mended a system of frequent examinations into the acquirements of certain learners—that it was like pulling up a plant repeatedly by its root to see how it grows. Bacon has never found a cultivator who possessed more of his own acquaintance with the analogies embraced by real wit, than your father. I am giving you unconnected remarks; the following relates to his profession. From some conversation which I once had with him, I suspect that one of his greatest feats of self-command, under high principle, was his abstaining from extemporaneous preaching, in which he felt his own capacity for producing a great and remarkable effect, but which, if my recollection is correct, he distrusted as an instrument of pulpit oratory.’

Few eminent men, perhaps, have had more anecdotes and witty sayings ascribed to them than he has; but it must be owned, also, that few have had more apocryphal stories recklessly attributed to them. Even in his lifetime, anecdotes, puns, and riddles of the most inferior character, which had been going the round of third-rate newspapers and journals for years, were continually ascribed to him; and he has been besieged with letters proposing answers to riddles and questions, attributed to him without a shadow of foundation.

In fact, there was a peculiarity in his brilliant sayings which very few have been able to seize. He generally put forth an anecdote or a witticism as an illustration of some important principle, or to give point to some carefully-weighed and clearly-stated argument; but—as one who knew him well has justly remarked—the majority of his hearers forgot the argument, and remembered only the anecdote or jest. And, so repeated, his wit not only lost its force by being taken separately from the subject it was intended to illustrate, but was also likely to lead to the false impression that he was a mere

propounder and retailer of 'good things,' as such, for no purpose but to make his audience laugh.

The following fragments, from the pen of a valued friend and near connexion, will illustrate the character of his powers of anecdote and repartee. One day, when conversing with this friend, something was said on the subject of religious persecution ; on which he remarked, 'It is no wonder that some English people have a taste for persecuting on account of religion, since it is the first lesson that most are taught in their nurseries.' His friend expressed his incredulity, and denied that *he*, at least, had been taught it. 'Are you sure?' replied Dr. Whately, 'What think you of this—

Old Daddy Longlegs *won't say his prayers,*  
Take him by the left leg, and throw him downstairs?

If that is not religious persecution, what is ?'

Being absolutely compelled, by the unwise solicitations of a clerical friend, to give his opinion as to that friend's performance of the service, he told him—'Well, then, if you really wish to know what I think of your reading, I should say there are only two parts of the service you read well, and those you read unexceptionably.' 'And what are those?' said the clergyman. They are, "Here endeth the first lesson," and "Here endeth the second lesson."

'What do you mean, Whately?'

'I mean,' he replied, 'that these parts you read in your own natural voice and manner, which are very good : the rest is all artificial and assumed.' It may be added that his friend took the hint, altered his style, and became a very good reader.

He often related another incident, illustrating his strongly expressed opinion (see his 'Rhetoric') that the

*natural* voice and manner are the best adapted to public speaking and reading, and also less trying to the voice than the artificial tone so generally preferred. A clerical friend of his, who had been accustomed to make use of this artificial tone, complained to him that he was suffering so much from weakness of the throat, he feared he must resign his post. Dr. Whately told him that he believed, if he would change his style of reading, and deliver the service in his natural voice, he would find it much less fatiguing. ‘Oh,’ said his friend, ‘that is all very well for you who have a powerful voice ; but mine is so feeble that it would be impossible to make myself heard in a church if I did not speak in an artificial tone.’

‘I believe you are mistaken,’ replied the former ; ‘you would find that even a weak voice would be better heard, and at the expense of less fatigue, if the tone were a natural one.’

The other appeared unconvinced ; but, meeting his adviser some time after, he told him he had at last come round to his view. The weakness in his throat had so increased that he was on the point of retiring from active duty, but resolved, as a desperate final effort, to try the experiment of altering his manner of reading and speaking. He did so, and not only succeeded beyond his hopes in making himself heard, but found his voice so much less fatigued by the effort, that he was able to continue his employment.

## CHAPTER III.

1828—1830.

Fragment on controversial writings—Letter to Dr. Copleston—His plan for educating his children—Sir Robert Peel and Catholic Emancipation—Supports Sir Robert, which leads to a breach with his early friends—Rupture with Dr. Newman—Elected Professor of Political Economy—Letter on School-house Lectures—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Passing of the Catholic Emancipation Bill—Interests himself for the re-election of Sir R. Peel—Publishes the ‘Errors of Romanism.’—Letter on National Distress—Letter on University Examinations—Proposal for gradual abolition of slavery.

To this period, as far as we can collect, belongs the following fragment on controversial writings :—

‘I should say it makes all the difference whether one is writing a popular book, or one designed for the learned few. In writing for these last, I should collect from the ancient fathers, and from various commentators and critics, whatever I met with that might throw light—even twilight—on any portion of an interesting subject. In a *popular* work, on the contrary, I should confine myself to such topics as are *immediately* accessible to the unlearned—*i.e.*, to nineteen-twentieths of what are called the higher classes, and all of the rest. I should appeal, chiefly if not entirely, to common sense, and to the plain portions of Scripture in the received version, with other books which are in most people’s hands.

‘If in any publication designed to be popular, and most especially in any question with the Church of Rome, I

found that the author was provided with an ample store of the most decisive testimonies from the greatest Biblical critics, and other writers of great weight, sufficient to convince any reader of intelligence, candour, learning, and diligence, I should be inclined to advise him, if he consulted me, to strike it all out: if not, however decisive his victory in the eyes of competent judges, I should expect that—orally or in writing—he would be met by opponents who would join issue on that portion of his argument (keeping all the rest out of sight) which turned most on matters of deep research and multifarious reading; boldly maintaining that he had misrepresented this or that author's opinions, that he had omitted the most weighty authorities, and that, in such-and-such points, the voice of the learned world was against him, &c. Who of the unlearned could tell which was in the right?

‘He might reply, and triumphantly disprove everything that had been urged against him; he would be met by fresh and fresh assertions and contradictions, and fresh appeals to authorities, real or imaginary; and so the contest might be kept up for ever. Meantime, the mass of the readers would be like a blind man who should be a bystander, though not a spectator, of a battle—incapable of judging which party was prevailing, except from the report of those who stand next him. Each would judge of the matter in dispute on the authority of the teacher whom he had been accustomed to reverence, or who was the most plausible in manners, or the most vehement in asseveration. And, moreover, all the readers (of the class I am speaking of) would have it impressed on their minds continually more and more, as the controversy went on, that the unlearned have nothing for it but to rest in implicit acquiescence on the authority of the qualified to guide them; being as incapable of gaining

access to, and reading, and understanding the voluminous works referred to, as of mastering the sciences of anatomy, pharmacy, &c. so that they must proceed as they do in the case of their health—*i.e.*, resort either to the family physician, or to anyone that they fancy, put themselves into his hands, and swallow what he prescribes, without any knowledge of the what or the why; only with this difference, that the errors of a doctor may be detected in *this* world, by his patient being cured, or the reverse; whereas the D.D., unlike the M.D., cannot be tried by experience till the day of judgment.

‘This supposed necessity of relying *implicitly* on the *authority* of a spiritual guide, is not stated and proved, once for all, as a distinct proposition, but is made to sink, gradually, more and more into the mind, in the course of such a controversy, from the obvious impossibility, to the unlearned, of verifying for themselves the statements on which each argument is made to turn.

‘And those who do not, thence, give themselves up to the authority of their respective leaders, are apt to infer that there are no means for the mass of mankind to ascertain religious truth, and that, consequently, there *is* no such thing; that as the religions of Brahma, Mahomet, and Christ, &c. all rest, as far as regards the people, on the same grounds—the assertions of the learned—and as they cannot be all true, a man of sense will *conform* to that which suits his taste or convenience, and *believe* none.

‘The issue of such a controversy, so conducted, in a popular work (supposing the intrinsic force of the argument to be completely on the Protestant side), I should expect to be—and as far as my observation has gone this expectation is confirmed—that the generality of the Romanists should be confirmed in their implicit reliance on an infallible

church, and that for one convert they lost, they would gain two, besides several converts to infidelity.

‘For these reasons I should, as I have said, rather avoid appeals to rare or voluminous works, to elaborate disquisitions, and to disputed passages of Scripture.

‘And, in the present case, I should keep clear of the conflicting opinions as to the precise interpretation of the prophecy respecting the “Man of Sin,” and confine myself to the delineation of the erroneous *principles* against which we are warned; and which must, at any rate, be the very *reason* of the warning. I should dwell on the “Sin,” not on the “Man;” and lead the reader to judge of the tree by its fruits, rather than of the fruits by the tree. If we guard them against the presumption of man’s putting himself in place of God, and “teaching for doctrines the commandments of men,” we strike at the root not only of *Popery*, but of *every* similar corruption, past, present, or future.’

The next letter before us is one addressed to his old friend and former tutor, Dr. Copleston, who had been appointed Bishop of Llandaff :—

‘Sept. 28, 1828.

‘My dear Lord,—It would have given me the greatest pleasure to accept your friendly invitation, but that I am detained by what may be rightly called a press of business, *i.e.* business of the press. I have no hard work, however, to do, which makes me wonder the more that I have had a succession of bilious attacks, at short intervals, ever since I left Tunbridge Wells. They seem to be going about very much in many parts; Mrs. W. has not been exempt. As soon as my present work is out of hand, I must set about preparing a new edition of the “Logic”—*my* “Logic,” as it is always and will be always called.

No acknowledgments will ever transfer to another the credit of a book which is published with one's name ; the only way, I believe, in which it could be done, would be to make *no* acknowledgments, and indicate a wish to conceal the assistance received.

‘ By-the-bye, I forget whether I told you of a curious adventure of my brother's : he was transacting some business at the Bank, and having in one of the offices signed his name, the clerk politely asked whether he was the Dr. Whately from whose work on “ Logic ” he had derived so much gratification. My brother expressed his surprise ; on which he told him that logic was his favourite study, and that he had felt particular obligations to this book. Presently he went into another office in the Bank, and there the clerk asked him the very same question.

‘ All this belongs as much at least to you as to me, and I hope it may mitigate your suspicion (which I have often heard you express), that the world is not ripe for a work of the kind.

‘ When you speak of Hawkins or me writing a tract for distribution, you should remember how long ago he wrote that excellent one, “ The Christian's Manual,” on which the society<sup>1</sup> have been deliberating these two years, and have not yet placed it on their list. I should, perhaps, find it difficult to write what would give satisfaction at once to others and myself. Almost all former writers use arguments of which a Papist may and generally does avail himself ; or such as are drawn from the Jewish Church, which do not apply ; or drawn from a misinterpretation of the word “ unity,” as employed in Scripture. And hardly any distinguish between the two very different cases, of a man who himself secedes, and one who

<sup>1</sup> The Christian Knowledge Society.

has been brought up a Dissenter. The latter case is one of much difficulty.

‘Your goddaughter threatens to outgrow her strength; she requires constant care to support her under such a prodigious shoot. She is very forward in understanding, but not alarmingly so. My plans of education fully answer my expectations: she has never yet learned anything as a task, and that, considering she has learned more than most, will make tasks far lighter when they do come; and she has never yet learned anything by rote, and I trust never will, till she turns Papist.

‘They say a letter should be a picture of the writer; if so, this ought to have been on yellow paper.’

The allusion to his children’s education is very characteristic. He greatly objected to teaching children to learn by rote what they did not understand. He used to say, that to teach thus mechanically, in the hope that the children would afterwards find out the meaning of what they had learned, was to make them ‘swallow their food first, and chew it afterwards.’

‘When Mrs. Whately and I first married,’ he observed, many years later, ‘one of the first things we agreed upon was, that should Providence send us children, we would never teach them anything that they did not understand.’ ‘Not even their prayers, my Lord?’ asked the person addressed. ‘No, not even their prayers,’ he replied. To the custom of teaching children of tender age to repeat prayers by rote, without attending to their sense, he objected even more strongly than to any other kind of mechanical teaching; as he considered it inculcated the idea, that a person is praying when merely repeating a form of words in which the mind and feelings have no part, which is destructive of the very essence of devotion.

The following extract from a letter to the Rev. J. Badeley, on the spirit of persecution in and out of our Church, will not be out of place here ; it is analogous to much which appears in his various essays on the peculiarities of the Church of Rome :—

‘Alban Hall : April 3, 1829.

‘I wish you to observe that the unpersecuting spirit of our Church is only that of (I would I could say all) her individual members : no declaration was ever made by our Church, as a body, that it is unchristian to inflict secular coercion and punishment on professors of a false religion. A man who should hold (as Bishop Jewel and others of our Reformers did) the right, and the duty, of putting down heresy by civil penalties (though I should think him, so far, an unenlightened Christian) might be an unimpeachable member of our Church. He might defy you to show anything against him in the Articles ; and if you appealed to the Canons, you would find them all on his side. Whether a man be Papist or Protestant in name, let him beware chiefly of Old Adam.’

\*This letter was in all probability occasioned by the controversy which agitated England this spring, respecting the admission of Roman Catholics to Parliament. In Oxford that agitation was felt with peculiar strength, because, in addition to the general interest which politico-religious questions excited in its society, there was the special excitement occasioned by the personal question, whether Mr. Peel, the great promoter of the change, should continue to be Member for the University. As for Dr. Whately’s share in this temporary convulsion, it amounted to no more than this, that he unhesitatingly supported a measure of which he had always, in less promising times, professed himself the staunch adherent.

But the effect produced on the knot of his friends and pupils was strong, and disheartening. It had no small influence in producing the trials and difficulties of his after-life. It is particularly observable, that several of those who were most conspicuous in the Oxford or Tractarian movement of some years later—nay, who followed that movement to its ultimate consequences, into the communion of the Church of Rome—ceased, now, to walk further with those whom, in their temporary Anglican zeal, they regarded, like Whately, as traitors to the Establishment. Dr. Newman has avowed that this was the case with himself. ‘In the beginning of 1829 came the grand breach between Dr. Whately and me; Mr. Peel’s attempted re-election was the occasion of it. I think, in 1827 or 1828, I had voted in the minority when the petition to Parliament against the Catholic claims was brought into convocation. I did so mainly on the views suggested to me by the theory of the “Letters of an Episcopalian.” . . . I took part against Mr. Peel on a simple academical, not at all on an ecclesiastical or a political ground; and this I professed at the time. . . . *Also by this time I was under the influence of Keble and Frœude*, who, in addition to the reasons I have given, disliked the Duke’s change of policy as dictated by liberalism.’ Dr. Newman then proceeds to tell, with an infinity of quiet humour, the anecdote which has been quoted so often from his book, concerning the trick played by Whately on him, in inviting him to meet a dinner-party of the ‘two-bottle orthodox,’ as a playful punishment for his abandonment of the liberal side.

Henceforth, however, there can be little doubt that Whately felt his position in the University less agreeable than it had formerly been. Strong political excitement widened the breach of feeling which had always existed,

between him and the old 'high-and-dry' majority of the residents. And those younger and more far-reaching spirits, with whom his sympathies had chiefly lain—of whom Newman, in his then state of mind, may be taken as an instance—were now detached from him, not because they had joined the old school, but because they were forming to themselves a new school; which began in fierce disapprobation of the 'liberal' mode of dealing with the Church, and, after many vicissitudes of thought—from which Whately's unchangeable consistency was altogether alien—ended for the most part by abandoning that Church. Whately's adherents, beyond the limited circle of his attached friends, were now few, and shared his unpopularity.

\*In 1829 Whately was elected Professor of Political Economy, in succession to Senior; his tenure of the office, however, was cut short by his appointment to Dublin in 1831. He published an introductory course of lectures (1831), of which the main purpose, in accordance with his usual love for clearing-up difficulties of thought by precision of language, was that of establishing the real scope and purpose of the science—which he described as 'to enquire into the nature, production, and distribution of wealth, not its connection with virtue and happiness.' To obviate the fallacies to which, in his opinion, the popular denomination of the science had given rise, he proposed to substitute for it that of 'Catallactics,' or the science of exchanges. But this new nomenclature did not succeed.\*

The letter which follows, to a friend whose name is not given, is chiefly on the subject of his acceptance of this professorship :—

'There is something consolatory in your description of the state of mind in the University some years ago. Compared with the darkness of that time, we are enjoying a

twilight, which there is therefore hope may brighten. We are still hard at work statute-mending, and begin to see land, though it is a task of double difficulty to frame what shall be at once an *improvement* and *passable* in Convocation. "We," you are to note, are the members, in number nine, of the committee, which would perhaps get on all the better if two-thirds of us were sound asleep. I compare it to the nine muses, who are always printed singing all at once on nine different themes.

'With respect to the Professorship of political economy, I have made up my mind to accept it if there is no rival candidate, which the Provost will undertake to ascertain. It is not, however, exactly from "having a fancy for it" that I am induced to do so; for though it is entertaining to me to read Senior's lectures, &c., and to converse on the subject with an intelligent companion, such is my natural laziness (which I believe you greatly underrate) that no taste for any subject ever yet did, or I believe ever will, bring me to set to *work* and systematically master it. In chemistry, in natural history, and several other pursuits, I am not without an interest; but it is only strong enough to pick up, in a lounging and desultory way, a little superficial smattering. Never did I *study* any subject—never did I, properly speaking, do any manner of *work*, except either from necessity or a sense of duty: In the present case there is, indeed, no precisely *definite* duty incumbent on *me*; but if it is right that a thing should be done, it must be right that *somebody* should do it: and some of my friends have persuaded me that this is a sort of crisis for the science in this place, such, that the occupying of the office by one of my profession and station may rescue it permanently from disrepute. Religious truth—which is, as you observe, the only description that calls for great

sacrifices—appears to me intimately connected, at this time especially, with the subject in question. *For it seems to me that before long, political economists, of some sort or other, must govern the world*; I mean that it will be with legislators as it is with physicians, lawyers, &c.—no one will be trusted who is not supposed at least to have systematically studied the sciences connected with his profession. Now the anti-Christians are striving hard to have this science to themselves, and to interweave with it their own notions; and if these efforts are not met, the rising generation will be at the mercy of these men in one way or another—as their disciples, or as their inferiors. I am thinking, in the event of my appointment, of making a sort of continuation of Paley's "Natural Theology," extending to the body-politic some such views as his respecting the natural.

'The carping spirit which you complain has crept into the "British Critic," I am in good hopes is likely in some degree to creep out of it. It is bad enough to be sure, but I think it *was* a great deal worse. May not a genuine reviewer, with his mixture of haughty self-sufficiency and flippant buffoonery, be aptly compared to an ancient mountebank and his merry-andrew combined?—the one full of puffing and arrogant pretension, while the other relieves his gravity from time to time by singing a merry song and showing off some monkey tricks, to keep the crowd in good-humour, that they may the more readily buy his master's doses of trash and poison. That is a capital article, though unequal, on Lord Burghley. The careless and luxuriant vigour of it is quite a contrast to the finished and elaborate article on Church Reform. The latter is, however, the work of some able and practised hand; and I do not know that its excellences are more conducive to the object of producing a powerful

and general effect, than the disdainful arrogance, &c. which you reckon among its faults.

‘The generality of readers give a man credit for as much, and only as much, superiority as he assumes, and conclude anything to be contemptible which they see treated with great contempt. What struck me as the strongest part, was the interpretation of Our Lord’s declarations, as having reference to the expectations of a temporal Messiah, though the topic might have been more forcibly urged by a Papist or a Protestant within a few years of the Reformation ; since, as it is, there is a difficulty in avoiding the charge of proving too much—in explaining, I mean, how it should not be a duty of the magistrate to *put down* heterodox teachers as he would thieves or coiners, inasmuch as the care of religion, no less than property, comes under his province. But if the reviewer had confined himself to a calm discussion of this topic, he would not so effectually have gained the ear of the “most thinking people.” Even his jokes about the fox without a tail, if not in the best taste, are probably (what is more to the purpose) in the popular taste. And that nosegay of nettles which he has culled towards the end—the collection of all the offensive expressions, unredeemed and unaccounted for by the context—struck me as a masterpiece of polemical art. But though admirably calculated to disparage a work in high and general esteem, (the “Episcopalian”), I should suspect, unless the book has obtained more circulation and influence than I had any idea of, it is likely to be in the condition of a top, which if let alone would drop, but is kept up by whipping. Now, if he proves the book to be worthless to the full satisfaction of 2,000 or 3,000 persons, who would otherwise never have heard of it, there is nothing gained by that ; and, on the other hand, he may even call it from obscurity

into notice. Of three books which head the article, *one* only is reviewed, and that with evident vehemence and earnestness. Now, if a writer speaks of a work with disdain, and then passes it by, he is generally believed ; but if he assures his readers over and over again, with strong asseverations, that it is utterly contemptible, they begin at last sometimes to suspect that it is not. This is like some of the overdone French bulletins, which annihilate a corps of the enemy to-day, and then rout them again to-morrow, and then gain a third victory over them next day, till at last the reader doubts whether they have gained any victory at all.

‘ I am convinced that I am regarded by all parties as a man too little to be relied on to hope effectual favour from any. I purposely began my career by declaring open war with both parties. For I considered that old age would, as it advanced, be likely to bring on more and more its three characteristic evils—procrastination, avarice, and timidity ; so that this, together with anxiety on account of my children, would be likely to paralyse my efforts in the cause of truth, unless I began by committing myself, so as to cut off all reasonable chance of success from truckling to the world ; in short, I burnt my ships to take away the chance of retreat. At present, therefore, I give myself no credit for heroism in accepting the professorship, as if by that I sacrificed my prospects, for I verily believe I have none to sacrifice. I have, however, no hope of making converts of those who have grown up in bigotry ; their carcasses must “ fall in the wilderness ; ” but the rising generation may be kept untainted, and brought into a good land. It is vain to pour water on the centre of a conflagration ; but by keeping the adjoining roofs wet, the fire may be prevented from spreading.’

The next letter is to his curate, Mr. Badeley, on the subject of delivering school-house lectures :—

‘Tunbridge Wells: August 11, 1829.

‘(Going to Eastbourne.)

‘My dear Sir,—I fear you must have been indeed overburdened by having so long had (which I had not the least notion of till your last letter) the whole duty of Halesworth to perform in Athill’s place, besides your other avocations, and your useful labours respecting your charities. I should be sorry to press you with any additional task at present ; nor, indeed, had I any intention of suggesting the evening lectures for any precise time, but only when you should have sufficient leisure. Nor, under any circumstances, is it a sort of thing I should think of absolutely demanding, because it is what cannot be worth doing at all if not done with hearty goodwill. A man may be hired like a labourer, or driven like a schoolboy, to take a written sermon into a pulpit, and read it with an audible voice ; but of familiar colloquial instruction it may be said, as of mercy, that its “ quality is not strained ; ” the heart must be in it, or there is no good done.

‘I am sorry you should take me for such an arrogant coxcomb as to “ enter the desk and deliver a lecture without any previous preparation ; ” I never was guilty of that, though the preparation was not always (as it was in general) made just before the lecture was given. I could think over what I had to say—sometimes two or three days before—and that often, while I was digging or out shooting ; different people have different ways of studying, but no one can do his best without study. And pray do not suppose that I was induced to give those lectures from a persuasion that I possessed some

uncommon gift denied to others. If I had been in that mind, I should have thought most of displaying eloquence, and perhaps I might have succeeded in gaining more admiration; but I should have done little or no good. A Christian minister has something better to think of than his own powers and his own credit. If another man is at hand, and the question is whether he or I shall deliver a discourse on some particular occasion, it is then time enough to consider which of us will do it the better; but when I am left to myself, I have only to consider whether or not my instruction will be better (not than somebody's else might have been, but) than none. It is the ruin of our Church that her ministers are too careful of their own credit, and too much afraid of affording "triumph to the Dissenters" by making an attempt and failing, while we forget that it is a standing matter of triumph—and, in some degree, of just triumph—to them, that we are dumb teachers, while we boast superior learning, taste, and sense, and that their weakness puts down our strength. That there may be a man who cannot give intelligible oral instruction to poor rustics on the principles of Christianity, I will not deny; but such a one ought not to be in orders, for he will never either read or preach in an edifying manner. And I will own that to do this in such a way as to display superior talents must be the lot of but a few, because superior talents implies what few possess. But that it requires superior talents to do this, in such a manner as to profit the people, is notoriously the reverse of fact. Every man is not eloquent, but every one can speak so as to be understood and attended to in his own particular business when he is quite in earnest; *e.g.*, a farmer can give his labourers a tolerable lecture on the work they are to do, a housekeeper always finds tongue enough to teach the

servants to cook and sweep, &c., and so of others. All but the regular ministers of the Gospel! We alone have not a word to say on our own professional subject to the people placed under us for instruction! Why, if a mechanic were thinking (as we are too apt to do) of the opinion his apprentices would form of him as a speaker he also would, I dare say, begin to feel nervous and modest, and would be content to read them a written discourse on shoemaking—and the shoes would never be made. As it is, it is for his interest that they should learn to make shoes, and therefore he finds words to teach them how.'

The next, to the Bishop of Llandaff, explains itself:—

‘Alban Hall: October 17, 1829.

‘I was surprised and gratified to hear so favourable an account of the state of your diocese, labouring as it does under the disadvantage of the Welsh language. The difference, however, is perhaps greater in appearance than in reality; at least, I am certain that in a vast many instances the clergy address their flocks in a language quite as unintelligible to the lower orders as English to a Welshman. And if they do not go about to the cottages, and instead of talking to the people, get *them* to talk and state their own impressions, the failure remains undetected. Now, at Eastbourne, Dr. B——, who was there when we visited it, and who used a very plain simple style, and did a vast deal of good, has been succeeded by a man who preaches, in a very audible voice, very orthodox sermons, in well-turned sentences, not one of which I am confident any one of the lower classes can make head or tail of; and, consequently, those who had acquired a desire for religious

instruction have gone in flocks to the meeting-house. It is often contended that this is a proof that the preceding pastor must have been methodistical, which seems to me very rash ; it only proves that he had imparted a hunger and thirst after *some* kind of religious instruction. Now, suppose the other some years hence succeeded by such a man as Dr. B—— ; would all who have then become Dissenters come back to the Church ? No such thing. If an active and judicious minister could in the course of several years reclaim a few, one at a time, it would be no small credit to him. The one change is like the upsetting of a ship, so that most of her cargo is canted at one shock into the sea ; the other, the fishing-up piece by piece, at low-water, scattered portions of that cargo. So that in consequence of these alternations (which must be of frequent occurrence), the result is, that the Church establishment is ultimately weakened even by the pious diligence of some of her own ministers. A continual drain is kept up of the most thoughtful and careful among her children ; the stupid and apathetic continue to go to church because their fathers did so before them.

‘ And thus we are in the condition of Laban when Jacob kept his flocks ; all the vigorous and thriving turn out ringstraked and speckled, and the feeble ones alone remain white, and continue in our flock. Then some people, observing the extravagances which many Dissenters fall into, say, “ Oh, we don’t want anything of this kind introduced into the Church—these fanatics had better be out of the pale than in ; ” as if they would of course have been just as wild had they remained among us. This is like the mistake many ignorant people are apt to make when they see a patient whose whole strength is drained away by an abscess—“ Oh ! this must be carrying

off bad humours; such a discharge as that would be poison if returned in the body;" not knowing that it *was* sound blood, flesh, and bone, though now corrupted.'

In this year was passed the Bill for Roman Catholic Emancipation, in consequence of which Sir Robert Peel lost his re-election at Oxford. Dr. Whately was among the very few 'heads of houses' who gave him his vote and advocated his cause. Through life he maintained this principle firmly—that to exclude *any* class of men from public offices, *in consequence* of their religion, was to make Christ's a 'kingdom of this world,' which He and His disciples had distinctly and expressly disclaimed; and also, that by tempting persons whose ambition might be stronger than their scruples, to profess a religion they believed false, in order to insure their worldly advancement, such measures were holding out a premium to hypocrisy and false profession. He would not argue on the ground that such-and-such persons were not likely to be *fit* to hold office; but he considered that the electors should be allowed to exercise their own judgment on such cases, and to elect the person *they* considered most worthy, being responsible to God and their own consciences for their choice.

He also considered that the real power of taking part in the government is given already, wherever the elective franchise exists; and that to allow this last, and refuse a seat in Parliament, is simply to irritate the minds of the class excluded, without really crippling their power of action; and he always appealed to history to show how uniformly the system of an excluded class, like the Helots and Gibeonites, had tended to injure the peace and prosperity of a country.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See the Annotations to Bacon's 21st 'Essay of Delays.'

Dr. Whately often made severe and sarcastic remarks on the treatment Sir R. Peel at this time received from his former partisans ; those who supported him at this juncture being precisely those who had hitherto kept aloof from him, and *vice versâ*.

The editor of the ‘Encyclopædia Metropolitana,’ to which Dr. Whately was so valuable a contributor, wrote to him at this time, to tell him he had directed his publisher to forward him a copy of a poem of his own, on ‘Catholic Emancipation.’ Dr. Whately replied, with his usual plainness of speech, by expressing a hope ‘he should not find more rhyme than reason in it.’ The poem was not sent, but the editor evinced no mortification at the rebuff.

It was about this time that Dr. Burgess, Bishop of Salisbury, having conceived a high opinion of Dr. Whately’s powers from the publication of the ‘Logic,’ wrote to propose that he should bring out an edition of Chillingworth’s ‘Religion of Protestants,’ with some additions of his own, offering to bear him harmless as to the expense of publishing the book in a cheap form for wide circulation. But his extreme scrupulousness on the subject of independence of action, and dread of even *seeming* to be in the position of a party-tool, induced him to decline.

In 1830 was published the third portion of his series of religious essays : that entitled ‘The Errors of Romanism.’

The letter which follows, written in the beginning of this year, speaks for itself. It shows the anxious care with which Dr. Whately endeavoured to apportion the relief of distress, so as to avoid the danger so often incurred in times of scarcity, of creating distress in one direction while endeavouring to mend it in another :—

‘I feel great doubts about the expediency of the cheap-

bread system—at least, if I rightly understand it. At first I thought it might only be a plan for checking exorbitant profits in the bakers, &c., by retailing, for a time, at wholesale price ; but your mention of a subscription to cover the loss, seems to imply that it is to be sold below prime cost. I need not say to you that I have no objection to bestowing charity, but I doubt the general expediency of this mode. If there is a certain quantity of corn in the country, which it is impossible (under the existing prohibition of importation) to increase, it is demonstrable that the more is eaten by one man, the less must be eaten by another. If, therefore, I buy a loaf, and give it to a poor man (or, which comes to the same, sell him two loaves at the price of one), I do a service indeed to that particular man, but, on the whole, I do nothing at all. It is true, the diminution of the total stock by that one loaf is imperceptible, the loss being immensely diffused and the benefit concentrated ; and so, if you beg a pinch of snuff from each of your acquaintance, you might fill your own box, and nobody would miss any ; but still it is demonstrable that (the total quantity being fixed) for every pinch of snuff in your box, somebody must take a pinch the less. In like manner it is demonstrable that you cannot benefit the poor in the way of food without increasing its quantity, though you may increase perceptibly the food of a small number at the expense of the community, and the quantity abstracted may be so small as not to be detected ; but if the example (and every charity ought to be such as to set a good example) should be followed in every parish, the consequence is demonstrable, that those who partook of this charity would be better fed, and those who did not worse fed (supposing always the total amount of food the same) than before—and that would be all. You are trying to lengthen the blanket by cutting off a

strip at one end and sewing it on at the other. I should not, however, object to this if the cheap food were bestowed as a *reward*, not on those in want merely, but on those of *extraordinary* sobriety, industry, and general good-conduct. If good boys have a larger slice of cake than the rest, this does not indeed increase the amount of cake, but it may increase good conduct. I do not, however, understand this to be the case.

‘I therefore greatly prefer giving (or, which comes to the same, selling cheap) coals, clothing, and other articles of which the quantity given is not subtracted from the total stock, but is produced in consequence of the demand. Of coal a great deal is not raised, or, if even raised, is left wasted, for want of an effectual demand; and if some society of vast wealth and beneficence would give a suit of flannel a year to every poor body in the kingdom, the other consumers of flannel would even be benefited in getting the article cheaper, through the increased prosperity of the manufacturers.

‘As for food, I like particularly to have all the bones and scraps that would otherwise be wasted, collected for soup; *that* does increase the quantity of food.’

The following letter to a friend, on the probable effect of an examination upon entrance at the University,<sup>1</sup> appears to have been written about this time, though the date is uncertain :—

‘I am obliged to you for stating the objections which have occurred to you to the proposed statute, as I thence derive little or no apprehension of hereafter being encountered with any fresh arguments of any weight omitted by you. It is also a great advantage to have the arguments

<sup>1</sup> See “Stanley’s Life of Arnold,” Letter clxxxvii.

drawn out, as you do, like regular soldiers in a fair field, instead of engaging with an indistinct or sophistical disputant, whose reasons are like a rabble of barbarians scattered up and down, and lurking in bushes. It would, however, be mortifying to me, to think that you had finally made up your mind on the question ; but I know that you are accustomed to state objections to any system or plan in their full force, for the sake of ascertaining all that can be said on each side.

‘The proposed plan is, as you judged, designed to operate on schools, much as the degree-examination statute did on colleges, in order that men may come to the University as a University—*i. e.*, sufficiently grounded in early rudiments to be capable of profiting by college-lectures, instead of having to acquire here the elementary knowledge which schools ought and profess to furnish.

‘The answer suggested is, that schools, as it is, perform their duty better than colleges. I deny that schools do perform their part better than colleges do theirs ; and I also maintain that, even if it were so, this would not render the proposed measure less desirable.

‘For the question is, not whether schoolmasters are as diligent as college-tutors, but whether they are as diligent as they might be induced to become. Both are servants of the public. Now, if you had two servants, neither of them giving complete satisfaction, but one of them less negligent than the other, you would not scruple to reform him, if opportunity offered, on the ground that the other was worse, especially if it so happened that the improvement of that other was in this way the most attainable—which is precisely my view of the present case. For I conceive that the Universities are capable of indefinite improvement, if we begin by this step ; but that,

unless we secure men's coming here tolerably grounded in elementary knowledge, we must ever remain, as is too much the case now, in great measure a school, and a bad school too, rather than a university.

‘ But I also dispute the fact. To compare schools generally with colleges generally, may seem a vague inquiry ; but take the most in repute of each—Eton, Westminster, Harrow, &c., *versus* Oriel, Brasenose, Balliol, Christchurch, &c.—I do believe that the tutors in all the higher colleges are for the most part exemplary in diligence ; I can testify for most of those at Oriel, from yourself to the present day, that they have laboured a good deal, even at what is out of their proper province—viz., teaching their pupils many things which they confessedly ought to have learned at school. Now, as for schools, I do assure you that in a late discussion at the Board, it was not only admitted that a great majority of the boys were sent off shamefully ill-grounded, but it was even urged, as an argument against the measure, that this could not possibly be avoided, and that consequently we should be requiring of masters what it was out of their power to perform. The numbers, it was contended, were so great as to make it impossible to secure an attention to elementary knowledge ; that we could never hope that they could instruct properly more than a very small proportion ; and that at the largest of all (Eton), if any boy turned out a sound scholar (except the few who have private tutors), it must be in spite of the system pursued there, and not in consequence of it. This, I say, was admitted on all hands. I had only to answer that I was confident they could do their duty better, and would, if we adopted the statute ; but if they really could not, the sooner they closed their doors the better.

‘You observe it is natural schools should be less negligently conducted than colleges, because the master’s bread depends on his reputation. It does so ; but I much doubt whether his reputation depends on his real merit—I mean merit of that kind which I have in view, viz., the diligent elementary instruction of the great mass. His reputation depends but too much on a small number of first-classes and prizes gained by boys he has brought up. It is like a lottery ; the sale of tickets depends indeed on the supposed chance of profit, but men’s calculations of this are dazzled by the blaze of a few £2,000 prizes. And as for the smaller schools, they bait their hooks for fond mothers, with roast beef and plum-pudding, salubrious air, clean sheets, &c.

‘I would not say, however, that if I had been left to mere antecedent conjecture, I might not have come to a different conclusion from what experience has taught me. And so, also, in the case of colleges, most of which, as you observe, do not depend for their bread on their reputation ; yet, in fact, is it found that those are the least diligent whose pecuniary motives are the weakest? If any stranger, ten years ago, had been told that the Principal of this Hall depended entirely, and the Provost of Oriel not at all, on the independent members of his society for his income, which would he have guessed to be most likely to exert himself in the cause of discipline and good education? Would he not have made a guess the very reverse of truth? And you should remember that it is a head of a *hall* that makes this remark.

‘I fully concur in what you say of the objectionable character of private tuition, in the extent it is now carried to ; and I rejoice to think that attentive reflection will bring you to the same conclusion to which it has long since brought me—viz., that it cannot be checked, to

any good purpose, if at all, by any other means than the adoption of the proposed plan. You complain, justly, that while tuition is *called* cheap, a father finds himself called upon to pay £50 to a private tutor beyond his calculations. Now this is not an evil confined to candidates for honours, whom you propose to preclude from receiving this private assistance. The great majority (to say three-fourths is much within compass) of the private tutors are those employed in dragging through their examinations men who have come too backward to keep up, unassisted, with the very humblest college-lectures. Indeed, one of the objections to our plan is, that it would throw out of employment these tutors, who are very deserving men! Some college-tutors may perhaps be negligent; but the pupils of many who I know are not so, are compelled, by their backward state, to resort to that help. Private tutors are the *crutches* of our lame system. If you can restore strength to a lame man, you do him good; but by simply *taking* away his crutches, you leave him worse off than before. And if the prohibition were enforced of private tuition to candidates for honours, the character indeed of private tutors might be changed, but the number would not be at all diminished; for the college-tutors would in many cases be induced to devote more of their time gladly to the higher description of men, and would thus be forced to omit more of such elementary lectures as they now give, so that more of the backward men would be driven to seek private help. The proposed plan would do all that could be done towards superseding the want of these crutches.

‘You observe that the head and tutors of any college are the best judges who is fit to be received into their society. True; and no one thinks of restricting them in *that*, if that is *all* they desire. My porter is a

member of the Hall ; and as long as he behaves peaceably, the University have nothing to do with him ; but if I seek to make him a member of the *University*, then surely that body, like every other society, must be allowed to be the most competent judge who shall be admitted as a member, and who excluded. The heads of houses, therefore, could not reasonably complain of any infringement of their rights, even had the proposed statute extended to every member of the University, instead of applying, as it does, to those only of the *independent* members who mean to *graduate* ; for it should be remembered that the character of each member of the University affects, *prò tanto*, the credit and welfare of the whole body. But if it be meant that the tutors of each college are better qualified than any publicly-appointed board of examiners to *ascertain the proficiency* of each candidate, this I would admit, if each college had separately the power of conferring degrees ; because they would have, probably, different kinds of examination for the degree, and different kinds of lectures preparatory to such examination ; and, consequently, each would be the best judge of the student's fitness for entering on the course of study required. But as it is, the college-lectures being supposed to have reference to the one common examination for degrees, I cannot see how the college-tutors of each society, separately, *can* be, on the whole, *better* fitted to judge of a candidate's admissibility than public examiners. At the utmost, they can only be *equally good* judges, for it is intended that the public examiners should be the *very college-tutors themselves*, or those who have been, or are fit to be, such. There are, suppose, fifty or sixty of these : now, if we suppose *each one* of these fully competent to the task (which is the most favourable supposition), then surely it would be possible

to find *two or three of them* competent. Now, supposing all college-tutors, in perpetual succession, fully able and willing to subject candidates to examination, and heads of houses also resolute to resist all solicitations, and admit none who were not fully approved; still, I should feel convinced that the effect on schools, both masters and boys, would be much stronger if the measure emanated from the *University*. Else why should not *colleges* give testimonials for degrees also? And then we are no longer a University, but a loose confederation of many Universities.

‘But you well know how remote from fact, and from possibility, is the hypothesis on which I have proceeded. A young man who has small store of learning, and still less of money, takes a fancy to marry a portionless girl; his immediate resource is to *take pupils* (*take in* would be the proper expression). He has only to ask enough: if he modestly ask £100, he may fail; but if his terms are from £200 to £300, ignorant parents conclude he must be qualified—especially if he have a D.D. degree, which they naturally conclude must imply the highest perfection of learning we can impart. He knows, perhaps, enough Greek to lecture in the Greek Testament (I speak advisedly), with the English by his side; his pupils come here, qualified as one might expect; and if one head of a house refuse them, another is prevailed on, by solicitation, and by promises of what shall be done *under a private tutor*; the men find themselves excluded (without most irksome and intense exertion) from attaining even mediocrity in academical studies; and their emulation is gradually diverted to pigeon-shooting and boat-racing, &c.

‘The more I consider the subject, the more I am convinced that we can never possess the character of a *University*, till we adopt a plan for securing, in all who are

admitted, a moderate foundation on which to build a course of manly study.'

The following letter, to Mr. Senior, explains the paper which it introduces, on the gradual abolition of slavery:—

‘Alban Hall; October 24, 1830.

‘My dear Senior,—Do you think it possible for any friend of a friend of a friend, &c., of yours to obtain for the plan on the other side, or anything like it, the notice of the Premier, or any influential member of administration? You will guess the author. It seems to me and to him, after much thought, the only thing to be done. Mr. Grey approved it.

‘The author fears it would excite alarm among all parties to publish the proposal in a pamphlet, and that, if possible, it should be suggested privately.

‘Have you got Sir E. Brydges’ pamphlet on Parliamentary Committees? Dr. Chalmers, and in fact every one to whom I have suggested it, approves of my splitting the Houses of Parliament.

‘Dr. C. has given me some very good hints on political economy; he seems rather inclined to Malthus’ notion about excess of capital; in all other points, I think, he thinks quite with you.

‘I crammed Mr. Grey with all the knowledge of Oxford I could, and sent him away, I think, pretty well satisfied.’

‘*Proposal for the gradual Abolition of Slavery.*

‘October 24, 1830.

‘On the difficulties and the importance of the question relating to the slave-colonies it is needless to insist; but it assumes a peculiarly important character at present, from the circumstance that petitions are in course of sig-

nature, almost throughout the kingdom, praying for an immediate and complete abolition of slavery. If any measure approaching to this were adopted, it must involve both negroes and whites in the most frightful misery. On the other hand, if no steps or no effectual steps are taken to meet the wishes of the petitioners (who, though not in all points well informed, are unquestionably prompted by humane motives), great and general dissatisfaction must be expected *to arise*. A plan, of which the following is a very brief sketch, has been suggested by an *experienced* person, who is ready, should it be deemed worth attention, to develope it in detail:—

‘ 1st. To commute a part (say half) the duties now levied on *colonial produce* for an equivalent tax on slaves.

‘ 2nd. In order to make the direct taxation just and acceptable, to give these colonies a small number of representatives in Parliament—as was proposed by Adam Smith in the case of the American colonies.<sup>1</sup>

‘ 3rd. To levy the tax on slaves *ad valorem*; the *master to fix* the value of each slave; he being bound to sell the slave at the price fixed by himself, either to government, or to the *slave himself*, if able and willing to purchase his freedom. It would thus become the *interest* of the master to prepare his slaves for freedom, and to emancipate them gradually in proportion as they become trained to the condition of free labourers.

‘ And the measure so often proposed, of allowing a slave the option of redeeming himself, would be cleared of its only (and that a heavy) objection; the owner would have to fix the price himself.

‘ A loss of some portion of revenue, after a certain interval, must be calculated on; but it would not be an

<sup>1</sup> ‘Wealth of Nations,’ book v. ch. 3.

absolute *loss*, since it would go to relieve a most distressed and to reconcile a most dissatisfied body of men—the planters. And ultimately, when the situation of the colonies allowed it, a land-tax, or some other source of revenue, might be resorted to, without any ground of complaint from the parties represented in Parliament.

‘The originator of the above proposal is ready to point out many other collateral advantages, to meet any objections that may be raised, and to prove both the pressing necessity for adopting *some* decisive measure, and the impossibility of devising *any other* that would in any degree meet the difficulties of the case.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Note by Bishop Hinds, see p. 147.

## CHAPTER IV.

1831.

Letter to Mr. Senior on Parliamentary Reform—Letter to the same on forming a Political Economy Society—His appointment to the See of Dublin—Various opinions respecting his elevation—Appears at a Levée without his Order—Climbing feats of his dog—Dissatisfaction at his elevation—Speech of the Bishop of Exeter—Dr. Whately's opinions respecting the Fourth Commandment—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on his appointment to the Primacy—Letter to Lady Mary Shepherd—Starts for Dublin—Attacked by a Birmingham mob—Narrow escape at Holyhead.

\*THE following letters, written during the leisure of this his last long vacation, speak for themselves. They show that their writer, like a true Aristotelian, was in favour of the Timocracy of that philosopher, or system of cumulative votes according to property :—

*On Parliamentary Reform.*

‘8<sup>th</sup> October (probably August), 1831.

‘My dear Senior,—As I have nothing better to do just now (σκολή δὲ πλείων ἢ θέλω πάρεστί μοι), I will send you my poor thoughts on Parliamentary Reform. There are various reasons for supposing that some modifications will be introduced; while, on the other hand, not only do Ministers profess a determination to abide by the principle of the Bill (which I apprehend is to make the representation more popular), but also it would be manifestly unsafe to make it *less* popular.

Whatever any one may think of the expediency of making 10*l.* occupants electors, it would be difficult now, directly, to raise the qualification. We are so placed that we can advance in a certain direction, but can scarcely recede.

‘And yet, not only are there objections to so low a qualification, but it has always seemed to me that the system could not last, but must go on to universal suffrage. The qualification is not only so low, but so *arbitrary* and *unequal* (10*l.* occupiers in some places being on a par with 20*l.* in others, and 5*l.* in others), that I think the line of distinction could never be maintained.

‘The evils of universal suffrage are chiefly two:—

1stly. The preponderance given to the *poor* over the rich, through their numerical superiority, as soon as they are put man for man on a level.

‘2ndly. The danger and evil of *mobs*—meaning by a *mob* a large *collection of people of whatever* rank; for then they always heat like new hay, and are governed by passion instead of reason. I verily think five common labourers deliberating together would be more likely to adopt wise and temperate measures than five thousand gentlemen.

‘Now to avoid the first evil, I would have *every one* (not convicted of any infamous crime, especially *bribery*, and not having received parochial relief since 1832, and paying rates) a voter; but those who possess certain property, *two, three, four*, or more votes, up to a certain point, as is the case in vestries. Thus a due weight would be given to property, and yet every one would feel that he had some voice in making the laws he is to obey, and improving the taxes he is to pay.

‘To remedy the second evil, I can think of nothing but some resemblance to the French plan of electing electors.

Let each voter choose, not a member of Parliament, but a *deputy*, who should possess, while holding the office, the elective franchise.

‘ These should not be chosen in each general election, but for a certain term of years (say seven), with a capability of being re-elected ; and let those *first* chosen draw lots, to sit for one, two, three, &c., or the whole seven years—that they might go out of office in succession, and be replaced by a perpetual *splicing*.

‘ Deputies should be chosen from each parish, or smaller district. And there would not be the same invidious and hardly intelligible distinction between one having the elective franchise because he rented a tenement of 10*l.*, and another not, who rented 9*l.* ; but one would have it and another not, because the one was *chosen* from real or supposed desert, and the other not.

‘ The *deputies* for the election of members should have all equal votes ; but the *electors* should have one or more votes according to their qualification.

‘ All tumult, delay, and canvassing at elections would be cut off. As the deputies or electors of members would not be above 400 or 500 in the largest county or town, a general election might be finished in a single day, or two at most.

‘ And if it were found or thought that any deputy had betrayed his trust, you would have only to elect another in his stead at the next term.

‘ The primary elections might, for all I can see, vote by ballot ; the deputies *vivâ voce*, that it might be seen by the persons they returned to Parliament how far they were worthy of the trust reposed in them.

‘ I think *both* of these alterations desirable, but they are not necessarily connected ; and if there were any insuperable objection to the one, the other might be adopted

notwithstanding. I cannot conceive any system either safe or permanent which should exclude both.

‘As for other points, it seems to me that it would be very desirable to give some places *alternate* representation in Parliament, as in Scotland, and as is the case of Irish Bishops. There are several places *but just* falling below the mark of those which return a member, which it seems very reasonable to give this right to, every other or every third Parliament. I would not, however, increase the members of the House; on the contrary, I would have several places which now send two members return only one, keeping up their advantage over those which now send one, by giving these only an alternate member.

‘I would have no candidate, either for the office of deputy or of members, allowed personally to *ask* a vote. It seems to me indecent, *contra bonos mores*, that either a seat in Parliament, or the possession of an elective franchise, should be openly acknowledged as something beneficial to the person holding it. And it is surely implied by a person’s begging for your vote, humbly thanking you for it, &c.

‘I know very well that members of Parliament do seek their own interest, or the gratification of their own vanity or ambition; but surely it is but *decent* that they should be at least supposed in courtesy to be actuated, chiefly at least, by public spirit. Now, so far as they do undertake a laborious office with a view to the public good, so far they deserve to receive the thanks of their constituents. Then, again, the voters do very often not only receive direct bribes, but when this is not the case, look to some indirect benefit to themselves in the votes they give—to the advancement in life of a son—the obtaining of a customer—to some advantage to their own town or district

at the expense of the community. But it is most indecent that these views should be avowed and recognised ; and such appears to me the case by talking of the elective franchise (as many speakers, on both sides, have done in the late debates) as a benefit and advantage to those possessing it. I have always been most indignant at the plea urged in favour of some of the boroughs proposed to be disfranchised: " These persons have a vested interest ; they ought not to be deprived of their property, unless it can be proved that they have abused their privileges," &c. I should have replied, not, as some did, by urging that private interest should give way to public, but that these persons *ought* to have *no* personal interest in the matter. So far as they are honest men, they are taking the trouble of selecting a fit person, not to promote private and local interests, but to legislate for the public. To deprive them of the elective franchise, therefore (if it seems expedient to the community), is not taking away from them any valuable property. Will any one have the effrontery to reply, " Yes, but we do reap advantage from having votes, because we get attention paid to our own peculiar interests " ? This is pleading your own wrong. A man might as well petition against the erection of a lighthouse, on the ground that he made a profit of plundering wrecks. But it is the same error to talk of conferring on such-and-such persons the elective franchise as a boon to them. So far as they make and consider it such (which, after all, we must expect many of them will do), they are abusing the trusts reposed in them ; at all events, let no practice be tolerated which shall imply a recognition of an abuse.

‘ I do think the law excluding clergymen from sitting in the House of Commons—passed, as it notoriously was, on account of one obnoxious individual—is a disgrace to the Legislature which cannot be too soon wiped off. I do not

wish to see clergymen in the House ; but if certain electors think fit to fix on a certain clergyman as their representative, it is most unreasonable to say, “ You *shall not* elect this man ! ” This ought decidedly to be at once remedied.

‘ To make the absurdity the more glaring, while a clergyman, who *may* have no cure, is absolutely excluded from Parliament, a bishop, who *must* have more business than any one can get through, is necessarily a member. And the junior bishop is kept away from his diocese to perform a duty which might be just as well entrusted to any clergyman. This childish regulation should be done away with at once.

‘ I am decidedly of opinion that the bishops should have no place in the House of Lords, the duties of the two situations being incompatible ; but should have the right of appointing *proxies*, who should be any peers, Irish or Scotch as well as English, whether *otherwise* entitled to a seat or not.

‘ And I think that the property of the Church should be more effectually represented by members from each diocese in the House of Commons, elected by all holders and tenants of glebe-lands, or other ecclesiastical property—the same property not giving any one a vote in the *county*.

‘ The cutting-off of the second member, from several places that now send two, might prevent the augmentation in the total number.

‘ These last suggestions might perhaps be too strongly opposed ; but the removing of the exclusion of clergymen from the House of Commons, and of the enforced attendance of the junior bishop, none I think could have the face to object to.

‘ Some may perhaps think, at the first glance, that my

reform is very democratical. I think that a more attentive mind will show that it is calculated to prevent, in the most effectual way, the inroads of excessive democracy. I can at least say that no one can dread more than myself a democratical government, chiefly because I am convinced it is the most *warlike*.

‘Our Radicals declaim against the ~~laws~~<sup>war</sup> entered into for the aggrandisement of kings, &c., not considering that national aggrandisement is at least as much sought by democracies, and that, besides ambition, they are apt to be hurried into a war by being in a passion.

‘Those who are capable of learning from experience may see this in the histories of Rome and of Athens in ancient times, and of the United States in modern ; and also by observing how all those of democratical principles among us have tried to urge us into a war with Holland and with Russia ; and how eager the French Republicans are, and ever have been, for war, with anybody and everybody.’

*To Nassau Senior, Esq.*

‘Sea Houses, Eastbourne : Aug. 11, 1831.

‘I am surprised at not hearing anything of you and your pamphlet. If at all, I should think it should appear at once, as the subjects of it are already under parliamentary discussion. I am disposed to fear, therefore, that you have abandoned the idea, which I should be very sorry for.

‘I have been doing next to nothing this vacation. The least labour fatigues me excessively, and yet I find hardly anything that amuses or relaxes me. In fact, the bow has been so long over-bent that it has nearly lost its elasticity. I think at the close of the present year of the professorship I shall resign it. One capable of so very little labour

as I am, ought to have absolutely nothing else to think of. There are volumes on volumes which I know I ought to read, but it is by great effort only that I can fix my attention on anything requiring thought, and that for not more than an hour in a day on an average, if so much. I shall have done something by having accepted the office, and put forth a vindication of the study. I wish, while I hold the situation, I may see a Political Economy Society formed. I think you and Tooke and five or six more might set it on foot, not insisting on any large number to begin with; and when once existing, many would readily *join* who would be but apathetic about *forming* it. And do not put the subscription too high.'

*To the Same.*

'Eastbourne: Aug. 21, 1831.

'Hinds observes, that when you speak of the relative population and capital of Ireland, you should remember that no inconsiderable portion of the capital on which the Irish subsist is *English*. While indeed they remain *here*, they may be regarded as a part of our population; but there is a continual ebb-tide of returning Irish, some labourers, and some beggars, but mostly *both* by turns, who seldom go home empty. At the mendicity office in Oxford, where a great majority of the applicants are Irish, they have sometimes, on being searched, been found to have one, two, or three sovereigns in their rags, and it is likely that most of those who are thus provided take care to keep away from such an office. Part of this may have been earned by labour, but an Irishman, who has thus collected a little hoard, will generally, if he can, beg his way home. All that is thus annually carried to Ireland is so much English capital devoted to the maintenance of Irishmen in Ireland.

‘To which must be added the frequent and large contributions made in the country to relieve Irish distress. This is, however, occasional ; the other is a constant, steady drain. Perhaps also, in speaking of the immigration of Irish *labourers*, it would be right to consider also that of Irish *beggars*: some who are incapable of work, some who prefer begging, some who cannot find work, at least not for a great part of their time. And they are the more freely relieved, on account of the want of poor-laws in Ireland, because a man cannot say, as to an Englishman, “Go to your parish.” This is certainly a heavy evil. It is even confidently stated that the Irish who are applied to by persons in distress, have got rid of them by paying their passage to England. May it not also be said that the Irish labourers, whose standard of decencies is so low, tend to bring down the English to the same level? If I am an English labourer, and am outbid by an Irishman, who lies on straw and lives on potatoes, I must accept the same wages (unless I go to the parish), and live the same piggish kind of life.

‘Now for a point of much higher importance. Hinds thinks strongly with me, and on grounds which had not at first occurred to me, that it is important not to state in this first pamphlet the specific funds from which Romish clergy in Ireland should be maintained, but merely defend the making of such a provision (on the ground of the danger in that particular country, consequent on the peculiar influence which a *Romish* priest has over his flock), and then warmly and copiously in a future pamphlet dwell on the two points which you have in fact omitted—viz.: first, what is the *right* (equitably) that the Legislature has to touch the Church endowments, and secondly, the principle according to which it should make a new distribution of them?

‘The first question should be answered by maintaining the right (to be very cautiously exercised on account of the precedent) of government to deprive of endowments, with a view to general utility. And remember, it is a right which extends to *all*, not merely ecclesiastical endowments—as, *e. g.*, to the universities, &c.

‘As to the second, do not put such a disposal on the principles you have hinted at, which will be applied in other cases when once the example is set, but on the peculiar state of Ireland at the present moment. I will send the MS. per coach, and beg you to look at what we have said in the blank leaves.

‘The best way to proceed in such a case as this is as one does in moving resolutions, one by one, at a public meeting, which you will often bring to adopt gradually a scheme which if first proposed as a whole would have been instantly rejected; thus here:—Resolved, 1. That it is highly expedient that a fixed maintenance should be provided for the Romish clergy in Ireland. 2. That we may do so with a safe conscience. 3. That a committee be appointed to take into consideration the best means of providing and of managing a fund for that purpose (this committee is to be a second pamphlet). If you determine that this fund shall be the means of certain bishoprics, do not proceed on the principle that these are ecclesiastical endowments originally given to the Romish Church, or that the Romish Church form a majority of the people for whom the endowment was made. This would open a door very shortly for indefinite and interminable spoliation of all endowments. But put it merely on the ground that this revenue is the most easily and with least public inconvenience made available. You have taken as a ground of procedure what should have been merely an answer to a cavil. When it is urged that the wisdom of

our ancestors appointed the existing system, you may fairly answer they never contemplated what now exists; there is an end of the objection, and there you should stop.'

The leisurely and speculative character of these letters from the seaside, in this the last summer of his Oxford life, show how little prepared he was for the event which was to decide the colour of all his future years.

The vacation, spent as usual between the seaside and his relatives at Tunbridge Wells, was closing, as it commonly did, with one of the annual family-visits to Dr. Arnold at Rugby, when the letter from Lord Grey, offering him the See of Dublin, reached him, having been forwarded to him from Oxford:—

*'Private.'*

Downing-street: Sept. 14, 1831.

'Rev. Sir,—Having been ordered by the King to commend for his Majesty's consideration the name of a person well qualified by his eminence in the Church to fill the vacant Archbishopric of Dublin, I have, after the most diligent enquiry, satisfied myself that I shall best accomplish the object which his Majesty has in view by proposing that you should be nominated to this high situation.

'I need not point out to you the important duties annexed to it, more especially at this moment, when the most unremitting care, under the direction of a firm, enlightened, and conciliating spirit, will be required to preserve the Church of Ireland from the dangers with which it is surrounded.

'An anxious wish to engage in this arduous task the qualities best fitted for its successful execution, and the

persuasion, derived from your high reputation, that they will be found in you, have alone induced me to make this offer, your acceptance of which will afford me the sincerest pleasure. May I request an early answer to this communication?

‘I remain, with great respect, sir,

‘Your very obedient, humble servant,

‘GREY.’

The sense of his merits and confidence in his powers, thus expressed by Lord Grey, could not but be gratifying to him as well as to his friends; but in other respects the announcement was one rather of painful anxiety than of pleasure. He received it in his usual manner. The letter was placed in his hands at the breakfast-table; he glanced over it, and, quietly putting it by, talked at breakfast of indifferent subjects; no one suspected that it contained matter of so much interest to all present.

‘He had a short struggle,’ Mrs.\*Whately writes in her *Reminiscences*, ‘in making up his mind to accept an office which to him involved much personal sacrifice. He had to resign a mode of life to which he was much attached, with duties in which he took a great interest, and among friends whose society was both dear and agreeable to him; while, on the other hand, great and painful responsibilities, duties as yet undefined, and difficulties little known, must inevitably meet him in Ireland. To balance all which, he did not possess even the ordinary love of place or desire of distinction, in the vulgar sense of the word. Nor did he want wealth, for we enjoyed a competence which met our wants and wishes. But the conviction that an important line of duty was opened to him, decided his acceptance.’

\*That Whately’s lofty character, and high reputation as

a scholar and a divine, fully justified his elevation, was admitted by all. But there was much speculation, at the time, as to what especial reason could have occasioned an appointment so much out of the common run, open to cavil from so many quarters, and so little ‘safe’ in the ordinary ministerial sense of the word. Whately had neither family nor personal interest, nor connexion with Ireland; he was entirely detached from all party, religious or political; he stood alone, in the insulation of a singularly proud as well as independent mind. We have Lord Grey’s testimony (given in his lordship’s evidence before the Committee appointed to enquire into National Education in Ireland, 1837), that when he offered him the archbishopric, he had never spoken to, written to, or to his knowledge seen him.\*

‘When he was appointed to the archbishopric,’ says his friend and (at that time) almost inseparable companion, Bishop Hinds, ‘*his work*, its importance, its difficulties, and its responsibilities, absorbed all his thoughts. He said to me, again and again, “My brain is written within and without, lamentation, and mourning, and woe;” and applied to himself those lines of Virgil—

Et me, quem dudum non ulla injecta movebant  
Tela, omnes terrent auræ, sonus excitat omnis.

‘The external circumstances of his elevation, instead of being in any way compensatory, were not even a set-off against the sacrifice of the free and independent habits of his life hitherto. The gilding of the pill served only to make it harder to swallow. The Order of St. Patrick, when he was obliged to wear it, hung round his neck as a thing that was in his way, and which he would gladly, if he could, have taken into a corner. On his first visit to London, he presented himself at William the Fourth’s levée without it—not designedly, but simply because he

had never thought of it. The King said to some one near him, "Is the Archbishop of Dublin ashamed of his Order?" The remark was repeated, a message sent to Dublin for it; and after a long search, and breaking open of some locks, it was found and despatched to him, in time for his being duly equipped in it on his next appearance at Court.

'He went to dine one day with the Lord-Lieutenant, and on this occasion the Order was not forgotten; but, in freeing himself from some annoyance it caused him, it became sadly misplaced. Lord Anglesey stepped to him and said, "Pardon me, Archbishop, but will you permit me to put your Order right?" and proceeded to do so, the Archbishop goodnaturedly saying, "If I had earned mine as your Excellency has yours, I dare say I should think more about it."'

Another trait, cited by Dr. Hinds, of his manner of receiving this first announcement of his new dignity, is equally indicative of the same feeling.

His love of exhibiting the climbing feats of his dog in Christchurch meadow, has been alluded to by Mr. Boulton. On this memorable visit to Rugby he had taken the dog with him. On the morning in which he had received Lord Grey's letter, Dr. Hinds writes; 'A visitor arrived who was a stranger to him, and was asked out to see the feats of his climbing dog. The animal performed as usual, and when he had reached his highest point of ascent, and was beginning his yell of wailing, Whately turned to the stranger and said, "What do you think of that?" *Visitor*: "I think that some besides the dog, when they find themselves at the top of the tree, would give the world they could get down again." *Whately*: "Arnold has told you." *Visitor*: "Has told me what?"

*Whately* : “ That I have been offered the Archbishopric of Dublin.” *Visitor* : “ I am very happy to hear it, but this, I assure you, is the first intimation I have had of it, and when my remark was made I had not the remotest idea that the thing was likely to take place.” ’

These recreations indeed were never entirely given up ; but the *Whately* of Christchurch meadow was changed—those pleasant chapters of his earlier life were closed for ever. A life of anxious toil, disappointment, misapprehension—often fruitless labours, only repaid by obloquy—philanthropic efforts met with suspicion—the sickness of heart of frequent failures—all this and more awaited him ; fame indeed, and sometimes brilliant and gratifying tributes to his endeavours, valued friendships too to cheer him under trial ; but the rest and the freedom of his old life were gone, and on earth there was little that could replace it. But he laboured for no earthly reward, and through all the years of toil and trial which were now to fall to his lot, he never seems to have repented the decision he had made, conscientiously and deliberately, at the call of *duty*.

The words of his old friend the Bishop of Llandaff will further illustrate the spirit in which he entered on his new office. ‘ *Dr. Whately*,’ writes the Bishop, ‘ accepted the arduous station proposed to him, purely, I believe, from public spirit and a sense of duty. Wealth, honour, and power, and title have no charms for him. He has great energy and intrepidity—a hardihood which sustains him against obloquy, when he knows he is discharging a duty, and he is generous and disinterested almost to a fault. His enlarged views, his sincerity, and his freedom from prejudice, are more than a compensation for his want of conciliating manners. When his character is understood,

he will, I think, acquire more influence with the Irish than he would with the English.’<sup>1</sup>

A similar tribute was given to his character by his friend Dr. Arnold, some time later :—

‘ Now, I am sure that, in point of real essential holiness, as far as man can judge, there does not live a truer Christian than Whately ; and it does grieve me most deeply to hear people speak of him as a dangerous and latitudinarian character, because in him the intellectual part of his nature keeps pace with the spiritual.’

And again : ‘ In Church matters they (the Government) have got Whately, and a signal blessing it is that they have him and listen to him ; a man so good and so great that no folly or wickedness of the most vile of factions will move him from his own purposes, or provoke him in disgust to forsake the defence of the Temple.’

\*At the same time (and this appears to be the proper place to notice it), the appointment was one which gave great dissatisfaction to a large class of the religious as well as the political world. Whately’s strong opinions (though he had never been so active as many others in urging them) in favour of Catholic Emancipation were, no doubt, the fundamental cause of much of this opposition. Mere politics, unconnected with religion, had also a good deal to answer for in the matter. But there were numbers, also, who honestly looked on him as a dangerous man, and all but heterodox in opinions. To us of this generation, who have to take our side in religious battles

<sup>1</sup> He said in the House of Lords (Aug. 1, 1833), that on the first communion which he received from Lord Grey, he made a spontaneous offer to consent to the diminution of the revenues of the see during his own life, provided it should appear that the general interests of the Protestant religion could be benefited thereby.

of far more searching importance—who are accustomed to see men, high in the confidence of respective church parties, assume the boldest license in approach towards Romanism on the one side, and Rationalism on the other—it seems almost out of date to notice the special grounds of disqualification which were then urged against Whately. These were—his views on the Sabbatarian question, and certain doctrinal statements of his respecting the character and attributes of the Saviour, which were regarded as verging on Sabellianism. On the first of these subjects, religious opinion in general, in the Church of England at least, has pretty nearly come round to him; the second is of an order which it would be out of place to discuss at length in these pages. Enough to say, that the hostility engendered by it is long ago forgotten, except by a very few champions of rigid verbal orthodoxy, who think it sin to make any allowance for the various forms under which Truth, on certain very abstruse subjects, presents itself to different minds, each equally determined to abide by it. ‘To which of its members,’ says a critic of some years later, ‘is the Church—or the country—more indebted than to Archbishop Whately? But because he ventured to deny that the Fourth Commandment is still binding, and reminded his logical pupils that the word *persona* means not an individual but a character, he is believed by thousands to be a “dangerous man.”’ \*

An attack on the appointment seemed therefore so popular an enterprise, that the ablest of the clerical opponents of Lord Grey’s government seized at once upon the occasion. The Bishop of Exeter said, in the House of Lords :—

‘Of the Archbishop of Dublin I will say, that I never

knew a man of greater powers, or of a more richly-cultivated mind. I never knew a man more strenuous in the pursuit of truth—more fearless to wherever that pursuit might lead him. In short, if ever I knew one man, more than another, who could be called a lover of truth, that man is the Archbishop of Dublin; and to say of any man that he is a strict lover of truth, amounts to saying that he is one of the best of men. But having said this, it will not be imagined that I speak invidiously when I say, that this very ardent love of truth, in one who happens to have erred in the pursuit of it, only makes him more unsafe as a guide, much more as the absolute arbiter of the opinion of others.<sup>1</sup> In short, my Lords, I must not be afraid of saying that the known opinions of the Archbishop of Dublin, upon an important theological question, are opinions which in a great degree disqualify him for the situation to which he has been appointed. His opinions denying the sacredness of the Sabbath have been put forth to the world, and for that he is answerable to the world. I perceive, from the demeanour of some noble lords around me, that they think this language is invidious. My Lords, I disclaim any such intention: I mean nothing invidious.’<sup>2</sup>

\*The Bishop of Exeter explained that his objections to the views of Whately on the question of the Sabbath, were founded on the fifth essay in the ‘Difficulties of St. Paul,’ first edition: but in the second edition, he found that the Archbishop had guarded his opinion more carefully. The Bishop of Llandaff on this occasion spoke well in support of his old friend, and Lord Grey justified his appointment.\*

<sup>1</sup> We must not criticise parliamentary language too closely: but did the Bishop mean that an untruthful man would be less unsafe as a guide?

<sup>2</sup> Hansard, March 22, 1832.

\*On this subject—as on other religious subjects—Whately's opinions, early thought out for himself, underwent little change or modification, in the one direction or the other. Generally speaking, Whately occupied an intermediate position throughout life, between the high dogmatic school in the Church, and the school which refines away dogma into mere sentiment. Neither suited his positive turn of mind : the first, because most of their doctrines seemed to him to rest on mere assumptions ; the second, because a religion without distinct doctrines was in his view impossible. The articles of his creed were therefore few, but they were adhered to with great steadiness ; and, it may be added, not without some tendency to depreciate those minds which could not rest satisfied with his 'common-sense' view (as some disparagingly called it) of Christianity. Those, particularly in his younger days, who were in constant search after novelty and 'progress' or 'development,' in matters of faith—whose

Religion seemed intended  
For nothing else but to be mended—

assumed a contemptuous attitude towards him, which (it must be confessed) he was not disinclined to return. Witness the following characteristic criticism on him, though of a somewhat later period than that with which we are now concerned, by a disciple of the Tractarian school in the days of its luxuriance :—

‘ Since his change to his present position, eleven years have passed over our heads—the most momentous, perhaps, in English history since the Reformation ; what effect have the events of these years had on this writer ?—how far have they enlarged the sphere of his mental vision ? He has sent forth from Dublin the very same sentiments, the same arguments, nay the same quotations, whether

from heathen authors or his friends' writings, which had been heard from the University pulpit.'<sup>1</sup>\*

The letters that follow show further the spirit in which he entered on his new sphere of duty, and also the affectionate concern he felt for the country parish with which he was now finally to cease all official connection. One of his earliest cares was to recommend to the notice of Ministers his former curate, Mr. Badeley, who was appointed his successor in the incumbency.

To his early friend and tutor, Bishop Copleston, he could open his whole mind as he could to few beside; and the letters addressed on this eventful autumn to him, throw more light than any others could on the struggles, the misgivings, and the aspirations with which he entered on his new sphere of work:—

‘Green’s Coffee House; Sept. 21, 1831.

‘The infirmity you complain of, of liking details of matters concerning your friends, is one without which friendship could hardly subsist. A man might be a philanthropist without it, but could hardly have private attachments.

‘You may guess how much I was gratified to find you express wishes which had been anticipated. Lord Grey’s letter and my answer are important documents; he made not only no stipulation, but no mention or hint, relative to church revenues; and I, in my answer, volunteered, not an offer, but a declared intention, to divest myself, in some way or other, of part of my revenues, to be applied to some purposes connected with religion.

‘Senior is now at Brussels, and I have not seen him since the pamphlet appeared. As far as I can conjecture from what I have heard him say, I should think he would

<sup>1</sup> ‘British Critic,’ 1842.

partly coincide with and partly differ from your lordship's remarks. He certainly entertains strong expectations that Romanism, so far from being strengthened, would be much weakened by a legal provision for the Romish clergy. At the same time he would, I think, recommend this measure equally, even if he had no hope of Romanism dying away ; for he would say, we should be at least *no worse* off than we are ; experience shows that the religion *will* flourish in the shade ; we cannot fix it *more* firmly than it *is* fixed under the present system.

‘The corner which your lordship’s argument goes to thrust him into, I think he would step into of his own accord. He would say that he *does* consider the object of an establishment to be “not the propagation of truth,” but the “preservation of quiet ;” that he has in view a political, not a religious object ; that the proper object of a *church*, as a religious community, is the promulgation of truth, however unpopular—*i. e.*, what we *believe* to be true (for, as Aristotle says, the object of pursuit is ἀπλῶς μὲν τὰ γὰθὸν, ἐκάστω δὲ, το δοκῶν) ; but that the legislators of a *civil* community are neither bound nor authorised to give a preference to their own religion (in their legislative capacity) over that of their subjects. If indeed a religion be *politically* destructive, it ought not to be endorsed ; but neither ought it then to be *tolerated* ; the obscene or bloody rites of Cotytto or Moloch ought not to be supported, either by government or by private subscription.

‘He would, however, deny that it *is* intended by his scheme to support a false religion. He would say that he is not for sending out Popish missionaries ; but there *is* the religion ; the priests are maintained ; the only question is whether the poor Irish, who think themselves bound to share their last potato with the priest, should be relieved from a burden they can ill bear. If you were to give a

poor Irishman a bushel of potatoes you would not be charged with supporting Popery; and yet probably the money he *would* have paid for the potatoes goes to pay the priests' dues, and the money, which in that case would have paid the priest, goes to buy clothing or some other needful article. Whether government bestows a certain quantity of provisions on the poor Irish, and thus saves them from being half-starved to pay their priests, or pays their priests and thus leaves them money to buy provisions, in either case it is the people that receive the relief: the only difference is, that you have in the one case, and not in the other, the political danger arising from a priesthood dependent on the zeal of their flocks, and, consequently, zealous to keep them true to their church, and at the same time ready to truckle to their passions. Such, as nearly as I can conjecture, would be Senior's views.

‘I myself am alarmed at his scheme on another ground: I fear the Dissenters throughout the empire clamouring for their share of endowments, and saying that 10 men have as fair a claim to 10 loaves as 1000 to 1000 loaves, and that they ought no more to be burdened with the maintenance of their religious teachers than the Romanists.

‘The case is one of great difficulty, and I do not see my way through it. *Lupum auribus teneo*. There are strong objections to every step that can be taken; only let us not forget what strong objections there are to standing still and taking no steps at all.

‘I should have observed, that when I spoke of S—having hopes of the Romish religion dying away, I do not know that he calculates much on *proselytism* to *our* Church, but looks to a reform or modification of the doctrines of those Irish who are now Roman Catholics. Your lordship is aware, I dare say, of the movement taking place among a considerable portion of the French (so-called) Gallican Church,

who, clinging to the name of Catholic, have renounced subjection to the Pope. And even those who should not in words renounce their connection with the Church of Rome, may yet be far from relying with implicit deference on its authority. With no greater inconsistency than one sees practised every day, they may make their subjection merely nominal, like that of the Maires du Palais in Paris to the ancient kings.

‘But I would even prefer seeing the Irish reform their Church, and bring it as far as possible to a state of purity, without its coalescing any more with the Church of England than those of Thessalonica, Philippi, and Corinth, which I imagine were perfectly friendly and yet perfectly independent. If a Liturgy, Articles, Rubric, and a system of discipline were to be devised, by the most consummate wisdom, for England, for Ireland, for the West Indies, and for Canada, I have little doubt that there would be somewhat different in each ; and I think this sort of variation is so far from breaking the bond of peace that it is the best preservative of it. A number of neighbouring families living in perfect amity will be thrown into discord as soon as you compel them to form one family, and to observe in things intrinsically indifferent the same rules : one, *e.g.*, likes early hours, and another late ; one likes the windows open, and another shut ; and thus, by being brought too close together, they are driven into ill-will by one being perpetually forced to give way to another. Of the same character are the dissensions which *arose* (though they subsequently assumed a different character) about church-music, the position of the communicants, the colour of a minister’s dress, the time of keeping Easter, &c. &c.

‘Believe me, ever yours most affectionately,

‘R. WHATELY.’

The following letter to a valued friend was written at this time, and has reference to the imputation of Sabelianism, to which allusion has already been made :—

‘Alban Hall : Sept. 25, 1831.

‘Dear Madam,—Having in the last (4th) edition of the “Logic,” recast and enlarged the article “Person” in the Appendix, I had a few copies struck off separate, for the use of such of my friends as possessed (which is probably your case) the earlier editions. The other articles relating to the same subject remain unaltered. I have, as you may suppose, little time for writing, but, if I had more, I could not presume to attempt a full explanation of so mysterious a subject. Part of what Scripture declares to us we shall, perhaps, be only able to comprehend when our faculties are enlarged in a better state. I agree with most divines in this, that they set out by admitting the nature of the Deity to be inscrutable ; what I differ from them in is, that most of them proceed in the same breath to give a metaphysical explanation of it. I recommend you by all means to study Hinds’ “Three Temples of the One God,”<sup>1</sup> and, I may add, all the works of the same author.

‘My present appointment—a call to the helm of a crazy ship in a storm—is one which nothing but an overpowering sense of duty would have induced me to accept. Let me hope for your prayers, that I may be supported in my appalling task, and enabled to bring at least some fragment of the wreck into the haven.

‘Believe me, dear madam, yours very faithfully,

‘R. WHATELY.’

To The Lady Mary Shepherd.

<sup>1</sup> ‘Three Temples of the One True God contrasted,’ 1830.

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

‘Sept. 28, 1831.

‘My dear Lord,—You forget that when Æneas was requested to give the details of his adventures, he had, for the present, got through them, and was placed comfortably on a sofa over a bowl of wine; whereas I am just launched on the stormy sea, and too intently thinking of each particular *before* me, to have leisure to look back. But I hope to have half an hour’s comparative comfort soon, and to talk over matters with you by word of mouth.

‘I am designing to start for Dublin the beginning of next week, and hope to be back soon, to help in the arrangements for removing my family; for we are desperately hurried to accomplish our departure tolerably early in autumn. I could not think of moving a delicate wife and five young children in winter.

‘You have known me too long not to know how harassing it is to me to have to make up my mind on a hundred different points every day, instead of concentrating my mind on a single pursuit, which is to others the severest kind of labour. What is properly called *business* is the specific poison to my constitution, and I apprehend will completely wear me out in a very few years, especially from the want of long vacations to recruit. And what is most provoking is, that what is designed to be, and generally is, the appropriate reward (the *μισθός*), for the drudgery of persons in high office, viz., as Aristotle says, the *τιμὴ καὶ γέρας*—rank, state, pomp, precedence, &c.—is to me just so much additional plague. I would rather work with Paul at his trade of tent-making, or have to go out fishing with Peter. And a formal dinner-party, even at Oxford, is a bore which I would gladly commute for nine-and-thirty stripes. I do not know that I have less

vanity than the generality of men, but mine is all of a *personal* kind (I do not mean in respect of bodily person), not connected with *station*. The *offer* of Archbishop was gratifying to my “organ of approbation”—the *acceptance* of the office is martyrdom.

‘The more I learn, from the most authentic sources, of the state of Ireland, and especially of the Church there, the more appalling does the danger appear. It is too late, I fear, to think of unexceptionable expedients to meet the emergency. It is a great loss to cut away masts and throw the cargo overboard, but the ship is on the eve of foundering. Some decisive steps must be taken, and that very speedily, if the Irish Church, or indeed Ireland, is to be saved. And in such a case, whoever objects to my proposed expedient may fairly be called on to suggest a better. I see clearly the alarming precedent involved in Senior’s suggestion, and have pointed it out to him. Can any way be thought of for paying the Roman Catholic priests without, at least openly, drawing the funds from our own Church? I am anxiously turning my thoughts towards this problem, though without a hope of devising any scheme altogether free from objections. Tithe-commutation, I am convinced, is one necessary step. In large districts of Ireland the Established Church is such as, by the help of a map, you might establish in Turkey or in China—viz., no place of worship, no congregation, no payment.

*To Bishop Copleston.*

‘Dublin: Thursday, Oct. 13, 1831.

‘My dear Lord,—Many thanks for your advice, which, as far as I can at present judge, I do not think I am likely to depart from; but I can decide nothing positively till after my return to Oxford, where probably a letter from Lord G. is waiting for me, in answer to one I wrote

to him containing nearly the substance of what I had written to you.

‘Hinds will, I trust, reach Oxford to-day, where he is wanted. His sermon last Sunday at the Bishop of Killaloe’s consecration was much admired. My brother preaches for me next Sunday, as I hope. The business which is now overpowering me is, I fear, nothing to what I am to expect. And the worst of it is, that our work in Ireland is like the labour in the trenches before a besieged town; it is all under a heavy fire. The Papists are goaded to madness by perpetual causes of irritation, and yet the Protestants are like the Jews in their last siege—tearing each other to pieces whenever the Romans gave them a respite.

‘P.S.—When I *am* Archbishop, pray address me by whatever designation affords the most pleasing associations to your own mind; if they are connected with your old pupil, Whately, my dignity will not be at all shocked.’<sup>1</sup>

In October 1831, accompanied by his brother, the Rev. Thomas Whately, and his friends, Dr. Hinds and Messrs. Hugh Acland and Sherlock Willis, he started for Dublin, where his consecration was to take place.

‘It had been arranged,’ writes his friend Dr. Hinds, ‘that he and Dr. Knox, who had been appointed to the Bishopric of Killaloe, should be consecrated together at the Castle Chapel. When the morning arrived, a little before the hour of service, Dr. Radcliffe discovered that he had not resigned Halesworth; and informed him that, by being consecrated before he had vacated the English living, he would violate the law, and that the penalty would be the forfeiture both of the archbishopric and the

<sup>1</sup> It is characteristic that when writing to old and intimate friends he signed himself through life—‘R. W.’

living, and also (if I recollect rightly) the being rendered incapable of holding any other ecclesiastical preferment either in England or in Ireland. It was, of course, necessary to postpone his consecration.'

This delay obliged Dr. Hinds to return to Oxford without waiting for his friends. The ceremony took place in St. Patrick's Cathedral, and immediately afterwards the whole party returned to England.

It may easily be supposed that he left the scene of so many years' labours and interests with feelings of pain. 'The year 1831,' writes my mother, 'had been physically and politically disturbed throughout the whole of Europe. The cholera had just reached England, and gave an additional feeling of uncertainty, in parting with our friends, whether we should meet again.'

A journey to Ireland was a very different thing then to what it is in these days of express-trains and swift-sailing steamers. To a family party it was, necessarily, a slow and rather anxious undertaking; and in this case it had nearly been a very eventful one, the Archbishop being twice preserved from imminent danger in the course of it.

The travelling-party was a large one, Mr. Sherlock Willis and Dr. Hinds being included, the latter in the capacity of domestic chaplain. At Birmingham they had an alarming proof of the excited state of public feeling. The bishops, having generally voted against the Reform Bill, were exceedingly unpopular; and when the family stopped at an hotel, the carriage was surrounded by a dense mass of squalid and lowering faces, ready apparently for any violent act. Some of them began to rub off the mud which concealed the coat-of-arms on the carriage; fortunately, it was an old family one, with no episcopal insignia; otherwise the Archbishop, who had always voted

for Reform, would in this instance have probably fallen a victim to anti-episcopal feelings; but the conviction of the mob, that a prelate must travel with the distinctive marks of his rank, saved him.

Two or three days later, he had an escape of a different kind, at Holyhead. On stopping for the night, he sallied forth, according to his custom, for a late stroll with Mr. Willis; the pier was then in progress, and being ill-lighted, they came unawares on an open quarry. Mr. Willis, who was foremost, had just time to cry ‘Stop!’ while himself in the act of falling. He was taken up insensible and severely hurt, and ten days were spent at Holyhead before the travelling-party were able to complete their journey and land at Howth, in the end of November.

The letter which follows, to Bishop Copleston, is sufficiently explained by this account:—

‘Dublin; Nov. 19, 1831.

‘My dear Lord,—You will, I dare say, be glad of a hasty line—though I have no time for more as yet—to say that we have arrived safe. Willis has a tedious wound in the face, but is in no danger, and is able to go about. My wife has borne all her trials, including severe seasickness, better than I could have hoped. I do think the wanton disregard of life shown by leaving open a deep pit, quite unfenced, close to the footway in a street, approaches near to murder. It was a dark night, and he a step or two before me, when I saw him suddenly vanish, and heard a heavy fall, followed by a groan, which I thought was probably his last. When drawn out, his first word, on recovering his senses, was to express his joy that it had not happened to me! These are the occasions on which the true hero shows himself.’

## CHAPTER V.

1832.

State of Protestant Church in Ireland—Question of Tithes—Arrives at Dublin—Enters on his official duties—His hospitable reception—His country-house at Redesdale—Anecdote of his rustic life—His simple tastes and pursuits—Apportions his time—Letter to Lord-Lieutenant on Tithes—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on State of Ireland—His First Charge, and consequent exposure to public obloquy—Letter to Dr. Pusey on National Judgments—Establishment of National Education system—Renewed hostility to the Archbishop and his measures—Founds a professorship of Political Economy—Speech at the formation of the Statistical Society—His weekly levées—Anecdotes of his Confirmation tours—His monthly dinners—Anecdotes of his controversial powers, and of his efforts to suppress mendicancy—Letter to Mr. Senior on Transportation—Letter to Earl Grey on Church matters—Letter to Mr. Senior on Ecclesiastical Government—Letter to Earl Grey on same subject—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Reform Bill—Letters to Miss Crabtree—Letter to Mr. Senior on Secondary Punishments—Letter to the Hon. Mr. Stanley on curtailing a clergyman's salary—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on University matters—Letter to Lord Grey on Church Reform—His opinions on Secondary Punishments—Letter to Sir T. Denman on same subject.

\*In order thoroughly to understand, and to appreciate, the conduct of Whately in accepting the Archbishopric of Dublin, it is necessary to bear in mind the critical (and apparently almost desperate) state of the Protestant Church of Ireland, referred to by Lord Grey in the letter already cited, which then prevailed. The first onslaught of the strong and compact Irish democracy, after it had obtained its great triumph of Catholic Emancipation, and aided in

the triumph of Parliamentary Reform, was directed against that Church. Then commenced the organized resistance to the payment of tithes, which for awhile seemed to imperil its very existence as an Establishment. And the Whig Government were deemed by the great body of its clergy little better than traitors, ready to abandon them to the common enemy as soon as they could do so without absolutely outraging public opinion.

\* It may serve as a convenient index to the contents of much of his correspondence, during this and the following years, to give in this place a summary of the Parliamentary history of the great struggle which occupied them.

\* In November 1831 the Newtownbarry riots, and in the September following those at Wallstown, excited to the utmost the mutual exasperation of parties. Tithes almost ceased to be collected through a great part of Ireland. In 1832 two Committees of the House of Lords sat on the subject, and a variety of schemes for reimbursing the Irish clergy the heavy losses which they had sustained, and for settling the question of Tithe itself, were agitated during that and the following years—to which frequent reference will be found in these pages. Dissatisfied with their prospect of Parliamentary redress, the friends of the Church in Ireland organized, in 1835, an association for the purpose of recovering tithes by exchequer process, which had considerable success, and a little daunted the assailants.

\* In this state of things, a measure was devised (1835) for the payment of arrears to the clergy by Government, reimbursable by a land-tax. But, on the attempt being made to place the whole matter on a permanent basis, a new and formidable question arose.

\* On the 30th March, 1835, Sir Robert Peel being then

prime minister, Lord John Russell proposed that the House of Commons should resolve itself into Committee for the purpose of considering the state of the Irish Church, with a view to applying any surplus left over from spiritual objects to the education of the people at large. The resolutions were carried, by a majority of 43, in a house of 611 members, on April 3. A second division having reaffirmed the principle, Sir Robert Peel resigned.

\* Lord Melbourne having succeeded him, the ministerial measure respecting Irish Tithes, embodying the principle, was brought forward on June 21, and it passed the Commons by a small majority; but the 'appropriation clauses' were struck out in Committee of the Lords, and Ministers consequently abandoned the Bill.

\* In 1836 the Tithe measure again passed the Commons, and the appropriation clauses were again rejected by the Lords. In 1837, the resumption of the question was prevented by the death of the King, and consequent dissolution. In 1838, Lord John Russell declared his intention of waiving perseverance in the irritating conflict between the two Houses which had continued so long, and embodying the principle contended for in some new measure. And therewith, after some more party divisions on incidental questions, the subject dropped; and a Bill, commuting tithe for rentcharge in Ireland, was quietly passed, without those clauses which had caused the fall of one ministry, and seriously endangered another.\*

The circumstances in which Dr. Whately found himself on first arriving in Dublin were thus very trying. Over and above those arising from his being a stranger suddenly placed in a novel position, full of anxiety and responsibility under the most favourable circumstances, there were peculiar sources of trial and difficulty in his case. He had to meet the strongest prejudices in those brought into

closest contact with him; and circumstances arose very soon, which brought him into painful collision with the greater number of those to whose support, under happier auspices, he might have looked, and whose opposition could not but be specially painful and distressing to him.

He bore all without a word of complaint, but his nerves were so overwrought, and his pulse became so high, that serious apprehensions were entertained for his health. Other causes, of a more gratifying nature, tended to keep up nervous excitement. He was a distinguished stranger, both personally and officially, and Irish hospitality was poured on him with all its genuine warmth and cordiality. He was entertained not only at the Viceregal Lodge, but by all who considered themselves entitled to invite him. To some dispositions this might have been a relaxation, but with him it was otherwise. He felt it as a demand on him that he should do his part in general conversation, at a time when he had no leisure thought nor feeling for it. At all times, though peculiarly fitted to shine in general society, he withdrew himself from it as much as he was able, preferring the society of his more intimate friends, and principally that of his own clergy, with whom he could feel more at ease.

With the Lord-Lieutenant, the late Marquis of Anglesey, he was on terms of the most friendly cordiality; but, except at regular dinners at the Castle or Lodge, their intercourse was chiefly official, for morning visits and evening parties were alike distasteful to him.

But it was impossible to live in Dublin and not to be under a continued pressure; and the result might have been very serious to his health, had he not engaged a country place (Redesdale), about four miles from Dublin, which was henceforth his chief abode, till within three years of his death.

‘That charming country residence,’ writes one who was with him at the time, ‘afforded just the kind of repose and relaxation which he required. There he could stroll about his garden, and, without the same oppression of spirit, think or talk over what required deliberation, while he was budding, pruning, turning up the earth with his spade, or making some novel experiment on tree or shrub. The easy distance from Dublin enabled him to be at the Palace for transacting business, between breakfast and dinner ; and he always returned home with a holiday feeling, whatever work he might have to do there in thinking or writing. To the last, however, the receiving and giving of entertainments was a service of duty.’

The chief part of the year was then passed by the whole family at Redesdale. His habits were now pretty much as they continued through life. He rose between seven and eight, and employed himself while dressing in meditating the subjects of letters, sermons, or literary undertakings ; he then spent an hour, less or more, in his garden. He took delight in performing the ordinary garden operations with his own hands, sometimes working hard at digging, lopping boughs, or felling trees ; at other times engaged in the lighter occupations of budding and grafting, in which he displayed much skill and ingenuity.

‘His observation of nature,’ writes a friend who knew him well, ‘was most universal and accurate, and nothing rare or monstrous in the works of nature escaped him. His remarks on and explanations of any phenomena in Natural History were most acute and ingenious. His botanical knowledge was considerable, and his acquaintance with practical gardening far superior to that of the generality of gardeners. He delighted in experiments on

the culture of plants and trees ; in budding, grafting, inarching, and other modes of propagating plants. His fondness for arboriculture indeed was a constant resource and agreeable relaxation ; and his combinations of one species of plant with another on the same stem, by “approach-grafting,” made his grounds at Redesdale a very chaos of whimsical curiosities.

‘Nec longum tempus, et ingens  
Exiit ad cœlum ramis felicibus arbos,  
Miraturque novas frondes, et non sua poma.

*Virg. Georg. ii. 80.*

‘The grounds of the friends with whom he stayed bear marks, to this day, of his enchanter’s hand and knife ; and his friends cherish these diversions of his multiform genius with careful remembrance, recalling his wise observations or ingenious conjectures, as he tried his experiments or perpetrated his varied outrages on nature.

‘He was particularly fond of books of Natural History and Gardening, and was well versed in old Gerard’s Herbal. He rarely forgot anything worth recalling in his varied reading. He had an Irish gardener at Redesdale at one time who was clever and skilful, and as conceited as if he had climbed to the very summit of the tree of knowledge. One day, as he was relating some of his boasted achievements in gardening, his master asked him, ironically, whether he had ever raised plants by *capillary attraction*? To which the gardener, totally unconscious of the joke, replied unhesitatingly, “Oh ! surely, my lord.”’

His love of animals of all kinds was a striking feature in his character ; there was scarcely a living creature, whether high or low on the scale of animated nature, which he did not take a pleasure in taming and watching. He could not walk round his meadow without stopping to lure the cows to follow him to be fed with branches ;

and even the habits of a frog or a snake would be watched with interest. To him these pursuits were never frivolous ; the smallest incident that could illustrate the wonderful adaptation of the habits of animals to their safety and welfare, was brought forward by him, and illustrated with the simple clearness of Paley in his ‘Natural Theology.’ ‘Do you know,’ he would observe, ‘why a dog never lies down till he has turned round and round three times ? It is manifestly an instinct given him in reference to his wild state, in which he would require to clear a space for his lair in the midst of grass or brush-wood.’ He breakfasted late and irregularly, but he liked to have his family and friends sitting with him to converse, and this was often the time when his thoughts would flow forth most freely to others ; sometimes throwing out in conversation the rough draft of some future work—sometimes giving a young person present a lecture on Logic, or Greek, or Mathematics, or Political Economy. The range of subjects on which he took a lively interest was a very wide one. But those which concerned the condition of mankind, whether mentally, socially, or politically viewed, were his favourites. Aristotle’s Ethics was a textbook from which he loved to teach.

Another standard favourite was Thucydides. There were passages from the History of the Plague at Athens, of the Corcyræan Sedition, &c., which he would quote almost verbatim, and with the most animated and enthusiastic delight. One passage relative to the character of the Athenians as a nation, to their dauntless courage and unflagging perseverance in war and conquest, is identified by all who were much in his society with his peculiar manner and voice. It always used to inspire him, he would say, with emulation, as being

the very picture, *mutatis mutandis*, of a noble Christian public spirit. None who were often in his society, were likely ever to forget the earnest enthusiasm with which he would repeat:—‘Whatever good appears to be within their power to attain by exertion, to leave it unattempted seems to them to be like losing their property (οἰκείων στέρεσθαι); if they fail in any enterprise, they set up some fresh hope of some other compensating advantage, and take the requisite steps to meet the present emergency. When successful, they of all men advance the furthest; when defeated, they fall back the least; they reckon it a holiday—a day of festival, recreation, and rest—to perform some service for their country: thus they proceed through their whole life, in toils and perils, so that one might rightly describe them as born to have no repose themselves nor to allow any to others,’ &c., &c. ‘Now they do it to obtain a corruptible crown.’

The middle of the day was devoted to business and literary labours, but when in the country, half-hours were snatched for rambles or gardening. Nor were these seasons of exemption from mental toil, for, as his friend has observed, it was his habit, while apparently absorbed in some experiment on shrub or tree, to meditate over the sermons or essays he had in hand; and often he would remark, that almost every tree and bush in his shrubbery-walks was associated in his mind with the subject of some one of his various works.

In the early part of the evening, when with his family, he generally read to himself, and enjoyed listening at the same time to music. He knew little of the art, and cared little or nothing for the classical or scientific; but any marked and simple melody pleased him, and he had a remarkably accurate and retentive memory for favourite tunes—asking for them again and again, and even recol-

lecting them when played to him in his last illness. He played well at chess and backgammon, and often found it a recreation after the business of the day: but reading was his most usual evening employment. He read with great rapidity, and had a remarkable power of seizing and retaining the cream of every book he took up, even those which he had seemed to 'skim through.' For tales and novels, except a few old favourites, he cared little; his favourite light reading was in the way of travels, natural history, arts and inventions, and books of stirring adventure—especially descriptions of savage life, and of characteristic manners and customs in various countries. He retired, however, at an early hour to his study, and was generally engaged in writing till late at night. The recreations we have mentioned, needful as they were to enable him to keep up his strength, were after all but short and interrupted; the amount of labour on which he had to enter was immense and varied, yet no subject which came before him was dismissed without accurate and close consideration.

The first letter of this year is to the Lord-Lieutenant, on the much-vexed question of Tithes:—

‘Jan. 14, 1832.

‘I enclose a paper which your Excellency has probably seen, because I wish to offer some remarks on the verbal explanation of it which I have received, and the verbal answer I have given. The object, I am informed, is to appoint a general agent, from Scotland, at a suitable salary, who, with the assistance of others, shall collect tythe or composition, or, in default of payment, distrain and convey the cattle from one previously-fixed station to another, till they shall be either sold in Ireland, or transported to Scotland for sale. Sufficient protection for the persons employed in this duty is to be obtained, partly

from such a force as Government may supply, and, where that proves insufficient, by persons paid for the purpose out of the Church Conservative Fund.

‘My reply was, that I declined subscribing to this fund, for the present, till I could ascertain whether Government would adopt any measures for taking the matter into their own hands, or some such plan as that I lately had the honour of submitting to your Excellency; which I considered as less likely to kindle a civil war, and should that be unavoidable, likely to give a less dangerous character to the struggle; but that I would certainly come forward as a contributor if I found no other resource left.

‘My reason for returning such an answer was, that I conceive the proposed plan to involve, I will not say the *first* step, but *a* step in a civil war. If men are employed in the protection or recovery of their property, and are assailed by a force against which Government cannot or will not afford them adequate protection, they naturally, and allowably, hire men to protect them, and increase the numbers and equipment of these as the increasing pressure of the emergency requires: from a dozen men armed with sticks, they proceed gradually to a hundred and to a thousand, armed with guns and swords, and regularly organized, differing from soldiers only in name, and in the command under which they serve. The opposite party to this (as it may be termed) anti-political union, are ready organized and active, and will increase their activity in proportion as they see need. Every move made on one side will be met by a counter-move; we advance a bishop, and they a knight; and move and move of the pawns on each side will be put in motion, till from petty skirmishes we come to pitched battles and regular sieges.

‘And all this time is Government to stand by and let its subjects fight it out between themselves?—or rather will it

not, *ipso facto*, cease to be a Government? That to which men look for protection is the virtual Government. It must take not only a part, but a leading and principal part, or it is virtually dissolved. And now is it better that this should be done at last or at first?

‘If a civil war is unavoidable, is it not better that it should be between the legitimate Government and its rebellious subjects, than between two parties of its subjects, both setting Government at naught?’

‘For these reasons I have urged Government to take on itself altogether, at once (without any fear of the unpopularity, which in fact is already incurred) the office of taking those steps which, we now see, will else be taken by individuals. But I have promised to unite with those individuals if there is no other resource, just as I would hire and arm private watchmen if no police could be had to defend my house.’

The next letter gives a general view of the state of Ireland as it appeared to him:—

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

‘Palace; January 19, 1832.

‘My dear Lord,—I have sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury a proposal, which I have been pressing on the Government here (I should like you to see it), for relieving the present distress of the clergy, and giving assurance to all parties that Government will vigorously assert their rights. If adopted, it will bring on a crisis at once—*i.e.* it will either put down and nip in the bud the spirit of resistance (and that, I think, is the more likely result), or it will force the agitators, instead of waiting till their schemes are ripe, to commit themselves prematurely against the Government. If there *is* to be a civil contest, I would much rather see it at once between Government

and subjects, than between two parties of subjects. It will be the sooner and more effectually put down, and will leave less disastrous effects.

‘I think it not unlikely that the Orange party-spirit, if called into action in the manner you speak of, may crush the opposite party for a time : but the permanent pacification of Ireland, through the Orange party, can only take place by the total extermination of the Roman Catholic population. This is not so generally *acknowledged* here as it is in reality *known*; and in England it is not understood. There are many instances on record of a conquering and a conquered nation or faction quietly amalgamating together; but then, that is by the exercise of some degree of moderation, firmness, and prudence on the part of the victors. Now, in all three of these requisites we are remarkably deficient. The English apply all they hear of the Irish national character to the Roman Catholics, and imagine that Protestants—men of their own church—are much such men as themselves; whereas a Roman Catholic and an Orangeman (with, of course, individual exceptions) are much more like each other than either of them to an Englishman; the chief difference, in respect of the present point, is implacability. The English are turbulent, violent, and unjust when their passions are roused; but they would not go on year after year, and generation after generation, trampling on, insulting, and tormenting a fallen foe. Here *parcere subjectis* is unknown. They are never weary of tyrannizing over the conquered. The very name of Orangeman is a sign. It is chosen *on purpose* to keep up the memory of a civil war, which every friend of humanity would wish to bury in oblivion. It is doing what among the heathen was reckoned an accursed deed, keeping a trophy *in repair*. The English would have too much, if not of Christian feeling, at least of good

taste, to assemble in Paris to celebrate the Battle of Waterloo. Here we parade Orange flags and decorate King William's statue, and play the tunes of insulting songs under the noses of the vanquished, till they are goaded to madness ; and it is curious that they are more studious to provoke than to disable their enemies ; they are like sportsmen, who preserve foxes on purpose to hunt them. Many instances have come to my knowledge of the most furious Orangemen stripping their estates of a Protestant tenantry, who have been there for generations, and letting their lands to Roman Catholics (who can afford to offer, at least, a higher rent, from being accustomed to a poorer style of living) for an advance of a shilling per acre !

‘ This being the character of the people, I say again that the permanent pacification of Ireland through the predominance of Orange spirit, must be by the *entire* extermination of at least all the adult males of the Roman Catholics. If *any* are left, mark my words, there will be, on the one side, oppression and vexatious insult ; on the other, assassination, burning, houghing of cattle, &c., till they have, or fancy they have, strength for a fresh outbreak—and so on, over and over again, to the end of time.

‘ Take care this letter does not set your house on fire, as it would mine, if found in it.

‘ You may remember I was a true prophet respecting the Catholic Relief Bill, in saying that it would not satisfy the people of Ireland ; I always felt sure it could not, under any circumstances, unless accompanied by other measures. And it was granted so late, so ungraciously, and so avowedly from intimidation, that whatever good it might have done was more than prevented.

‘ Still I should have voted for it, and would, if the question were now to come on. The deliberations on that

question always appeared to me, what Aristotle says never take place, deliberations on the *past*.

‘I am not sure whether I may not misunderstand your brief notice of my sermon ; but you seem to me to suppose me to say, that there are certain of our instinctive feelings which are implanted for no good purpose, and ought to be extirpated or suppressed. That was not my meaning. I hold that all our instincts are implanted for useful purposes, and that no one of them is *in itself* opposed to reason. *Without* instinctive propensities man could hardly be called an “animal ;” with *nothing else*, he could not be called a “rational” animal. Nor are we to act sometimes on reason and *sometimes* on instinct, as if either could be *substituted* for the other. They are like the lame man on the blind man’s back. *E.g.*, the instinctive appetite for food is implanted for a good and necessary purpose ; but instinct does not tell us how to *procure* or prepare food. And so of the rest. I believe there is also an instinctive tendency to devotion—to the worship of some superior Being ; but this does not teach us (else Revelation would be needless) whether to worship the sun and moon, or a block of stone, or what. “Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship,” says Revelation, “Him declare I unto you.” There is again (to come to the point before us) an instinctive apprehension of punishment for sin ; this also is implanted for a good purpose ; but it does not teach us *how* and *where* punishment is to be apprehended, or how to escape it. Revelation here comes in again and tells us, that “God hath *appointed a day* in which He will judge the world in righteousness.” If any one insists on temporal retribution, or would have people left in that belief, though reason is against it, on the ground that they are following an instinct which is implanted for a good purpose, I should answer, not that

the instinct is bad, but that he is not applying it aright—that he is not asking it, as it were, the *proper question*. I would deny that he is properly led by Nature—he is led by a *part* of his nature, instead of the *whole*; just as if he should justify image-worship on the ground that the idolater is complying, as he certainly is, with an instinctive tendency to veneration, implanted for a good purpose, and therefore ought not be disturbed in his worship by being taught that reason is against it. In fact, I have no doubt that this procedure is very common among Roman Catholics, many of whom must have the sense to perceive that some of their practices will not bear the test of reason, but conceive that in such cases we ought not to call in reason at all, but be led by the feelings which God has implanted instead.

‘I have been preaching for the Association for Discountenancing Vice, &c. (answering to the Christian Knowledge Society); the church was immensely crowded, by people who came, I find, to hear what I had to say relative to the Education Board. I preached a sermon delivered seven years before at Bungay, and again, as you may remember, at Abingdon, when I took your place before the Christian Knowledge Society.’ . . . . .

The Archbishop’s charge, delivered this year, exposed him to serious animadversions. The Asiatic cholera was for the first time raging in Ireland, and the dismay and excitement were general. At such a time, he felt the importance of pointing out certain dangers and errors, to which men were tempted under so new and alarming a state of things. Especially he believed it his duty to protest against the prevalent tendency of declaring this affliction to be a national judgment, and not only this, but a judgment for the sins of the Ministry; which led men often rather to take cognisance of other men’s sins

than their own, and, instead of ‘humbling *themselves* under the mighty hand of God,’ to pass judgment rashly on those of whose political or other opinions they disapproved.

In thus protesting against a tendency peculiarly likely to prevail at such times, it was impossible the Archbishop could escape running directly counter to a large number of those about him, whose views on this subject differed widely from his own.

Nor was this all: the practical part of his charge displeased some, as much as the theoretical part did others; and as the remarks he then made as to the duty of his clergy in times of pestilence have been grossly misrepresented, it is needful to allude to them here. He has been accused of discouraging the clergy from visiting cholera patients; and this has been ascribed by some to undue terror of the disease, and by others to a desire to make himself popular with his clergy! To those who knew him, it is needless to observe that neither of these motives could have the smallest influence with him at any time, as he was incapable of harbouring them; but the fact is, what he did say has been misrepresented. As long as a man was in a state to be benefited by pastoral exhortation—as long as his soul might really be stirred up to repent and turn to his Saviour—the Archbishop would at all times have been the last to discourage the visits of his clergy to the sick. What he *did* deprecate, was the well-meant but useless devotedness of those who went to pray and read to patients already delirious or insensible; whose minds could not be roused, or consoled, or instructed, and with whom, therefore, no rites administered could be of any avail, in the estimation of Protestant Christians, who consider that the benefit of prayers and sacraments must depend on the state of mind of the

recipient. To administer the Lord's Supper to one so enfeebled and prostrated, by pain and disease, as to be unable spiritually to enter into the blessings of the ordinance, the Archbishop regarded as a profanation of the rite.<sup>1</sup>

The following letter to Dr. Pusey will explain his views on National Judgments, and appears to have been written at this period :—

‘ My dear Pusey,—I have read your sermon, and the note on National Judgments. Of the latter, I cannot be sure whether I agree with it or not ; because, to confess the truth, with a friend's freedom, I cannot decidedly make out what your meaning is ; whether from the indistinctness of your expressions or of my own head, which is tired by great variety of business, I cannot tell.

‘ You draw clearly enough the distinction, which all I suppose must acknowledge, between natural and supernatural (or miraculous) connections : as, *e.g.*, temperance with health and intemperance with disease, good faith and benevolence with confidence and good repute, and treachery and oppression with discredit and disquiet, &c. &c., are things connected generally, though not invariably, with each other, according to the ordinary course of nature. On the other hand, there was a supernatural or miraculous connection between trust in God's promise, and the retiring of the Red Sea—between idolatry and whoredom with Midian, and a plague—between the sin of asking for a king, and an unusual and solemnly-announced thunderstorm — between refusal to worship an idol, and deliverance from the furnace at Babylon, &c

<sup>1</sup> ‘ I feel sure,’ are his words, ‘ that no sense of personal danger will deter you from doing your duty as Christ's ministers, on any occasion where you can be of real service to the souls of men.’

Some talk as if these last were more the works of God than the other, though I suppose they would not deliberately speak so ; but the difference between the two cases plainly is not in relation to God, but to *us*. In the one the connection, being according to the ordinary course of things, can be easily perceived ; in the other it cannot, without a special explanation. *E.g.*, there was no perceptible connection, according to the usual course of nature, between the fact of asking a king and the occurrence of a storm ; but Samuel's prophecy explained and established this connection, *i.e. made* the storm a *sign*. The connection of poverty with negligence and prodigality is no less a Divine appointment, but it is perceptible from experience by the light of reason.

‘ Now that, besides the natural, there were also supernatural rewards and punishments, of a temporal character, sent to the Jews, both individually and collectively, all allow. The only question seems to be, whether this system extends to us or not. If so, we may, from the moral good or evil character of an individual or nation, anticipate prosperity or adversity, respectively, in regard to such things as have no more mere natural connection with those points of morality than rain or drought have with piety and impiety. And, again, we may reason back, so as from prosperity and adversity to prove good or bad moral conduct. Thus, under the old dispensation, the death of the ten spies who brought up an ill-report of the Promised Land, and the deliverance of Caleb and Joshua, was a fair proof, according to the then system, that the former had done wrong and the latter right. In Our Lord's time, He would not allow the application of this kind of reasoning in the case of the man born blind, of those on whom the tower fell, &c. Now the meaning which seems to me to be conveyed in your note (though

I by no means feel sure that I understand you aright) is, that temporal judgments are still awarded to nations for their sins (even sins which have no *natural* connection with the sufferings), as to the Jews of old ; only with this difference, that *now* we cannot decide *what* sins they are sent *for*. But this seems to nullify the whole character of the system. A sign which has no signification, or (which amounts to the same) whose signification must be unknown, seems a contradiction in terms. “ If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who will prepare for the battle ? ” That there is sin among us, and that all sin is offensive to God, and that if we repent we shall obtain Divine pardon in respect of the next life, is very true, though nothing that Christians have to *learn* ; and if these truths (not intermingled with errors) are impressed on the minds of any by the daily mortality around them, this is matter of rejoicing. But are we also to understand that these nations or generations which have suffered most from famine or pestilence, are “ sinners above all ” the rest ? or that on our repentance we shall be surely delivered from these temporal sufferings — sufferings, remember, of which Christians and the apostles so largely partook ? or are we thus to learn *what* particular things are displeasing to God ? One man, in a sermon which some friends of mine heard, attributed a wet harvest to the passing of the Roman Catholic Relief Bill ; some, in this country, attribute the cholera to the superstitions of the Church of Rome, and the infidelity of the present Ministers ; another, a chaplain of Lord Brougham’s, ascribes it to the Tory opposition to the Reform Bill, &c. &c. To interpret events in this manner is as idle as to consult the ringing of bells, which sound to each just what each thinks. God speaks some things to us plainly, in the ordinary course of His providence, and has taught us others in

a well-authenticated revelation; but whenever He sends us a special message, He will surely not leave us in doubt whether it be such or not, and what is the purport of it.

‘It does seem to me not a little presumptuous to be perpetually giving out that “The Lord hath said . . . . when the Lord hath not spoken;” and there seems to be a great error in the ground on which it is usual to declare this or that to be a special judgment, viz. the magnitude of each event. A bowl-full of water wrung from Gideon’s fleece was a sufficient indication of the Divine will, when it was clearly appointed so; *without* that clear appointment, the overflowing of a river would be none. But, as I have said, I am not certain of your meaning.

‘I am glad to find you keep clear of the notions which make a modern church of stone answer to the Jewish Temple; but I could not insure you from a charge of heterodoxy on that ground; I suspect Mr. —— would censure you. You will find it a very nice point indeed, to keep quite safe from all appearance of deviation from orthodoxy, unless you adopt the one sure and compendious expedient (which has, however, its objections), of resolving at all events to *be* orthodox. You will understand, of course, that I do not use the word in its etymological sense, to denote that which is *really* the true opinion—in which sense no man can be certain till the day of judgment who is orthodox; but in the ordinary acceptation of words, when we speak of orthodoxy, we are understood to mean whatever is commonly accounted such—viz., the doctrine maintained by the majority of the most influential among theologians. These should be made the standard; their mode of study copied, their interpretations adopted, by one who is bent on being *orthodox*. He whose great object is to be *Scriptural*,

should study the Scriptures with all the help, indeed, of every kind that he can obtain, but with a thorough devotion to *his* object, and a resolution to sacrifice, if necessary, anything or everything to that. Each may thus come as near to his own object as the imperfection of the human faculties will permit. And let every one choose his own standard; but let no one aim at the unattainable and inconsistent object of serving *two* masters. Let him not say that the orthodox and the Scriptural are not adverse, like God and Mammon. It is not because they are necessarily hostile that no man can serve two masters, but simply because they *are* two and not *one*. It is like seeking to make both gold and silver the standard of currency. Their relative value varies but seldom, and very slightly; but the slightest variation throws all accounts into confusion, if we attempt to make *both* a standard. In proportion as pure religion prevails in any age and country, the orthodox and the Scriptural approach towards coincidence, and the adherents of each approach in respect of the doctrines themselves which they maintain; but still they go on different principles, like one man going by the clock and another by the dial. And he who aims at conforming to each of two standards is a "double-minded man, and will be unstable in all his ways."

'My heterodoxy (and the same, I think, will apply to Hinds) consists chiefly in waiving a good many subtle questions agitated by various "ans" and "ites" and "ists," and in keeping clear of sundry metaphysical distinctions relative to the mode of existence of the Divine and the human mind, which are beyond my comprehension, and which I am disposed to think would have been brought down to the level of it by Scripture, had they been necessary points of a saving faith.

‘I am, however, ready to stand corrected, I trust, when any of my views can be proved unscriptural; and your opinion, in particular, will always have great weight with me, whenever you pronounce on any work of mine read *previously* to your making up your own mind. In the present case, mine and Hinds’ views were not judged by you till afterwards. And, though I do not say that your opinion is therefore to be disregarded, I cannot but remember that it is a task of the utmost difficulty to take the same unbiassed view of any work, after you have both formed and written your own opinion, as you would have taken before.’

It can be easily seen, even thus far, that the Archbishop was now placed in circumstances of no ordinary difficulty and trial. As has been observed, he had to encounter prejudices of many kinds: first, as an Englishman and an Oxford scholar; then, again, as the appointment of a Whig Ministry—this being, in the eyes of many in Ireland at that time, sufficient to imply at once reckless Liberalism and encouragement of Popery. Then, again, rumours had reached them as to his religious opinions, of which very little was known in reality, and much conjectured which was sufficiently remote from the truth.

He did not ‘wear the regulation uniform,’ or express himself as they had been accustomed to hear orthodox divines express themselves; and therefore many hastily concluded he must be heterodox, though how and in what way they, perhaps, would hardly have been able to explain. Vague rumours that he was a Papist, a Socinian, one who taught universal scepticism, &c. &c., were circulated and believed by many who had never heard him speak, or read a line of his works.

But this was not all. An event occurred within the first year of his installation which tended, more than almost

any other could, to increase this prevalent spirit of hostility against the new diocesan. This was the establishment of the celebrated system of National Education, introduced chiefly through the instrumentality of Mr. Stanley (now Earl of Derby), then Chief Secretary for Ireland.<sup>1</sup> The question was one of absorbing interest in the country; and the feeling, when the outline of the plan was made known, was one of general dismay among a very large body both of the clergy and laity. It was then and afterwards affirmed, that Dr. Whately had been sent to Ireland for the very purpose of carrying out the system.

It is not the fit province of a work like this to give a detailed history of the operation of this system in Ireland. The letters here given will show what the Archbishop's part in it was. The full and complete history of the whole undertaking must be left to better-qualified pens and later times. Perhaps it is scarcely possible till more years have passed, and the freshness and vehemence of personal feeling have subsided, that the whole should be viewed, as every transaction ought to be viewed, with the eye of an historian, and not of a partisan.

That the Archbishop entered on the undertaking with the most earnest and single-minded desire of extending the blessings at least of civilisation and intellectual culture, and, as far as he thought practicable, Scriptural knowledge likewise, as widely as possible among his adopted countrymen of all creeds, no one who knew

<sup>1</sup> In Sept. 1831, the system established by the Kildare-street Society having fallen into disfavour as too exclusive, Mr. Stanley moved for and obtained the sum of 30,000*l.*, to be applied for educational objects in Ireland, and a Board was created to superintend the distribution. Such was the commencement of the system in question, in the very month of Dr. Whately's appointment; but the writer of this memoir can bring the Archbishop's own repeated declarations in testimony that he was never consulted about it till after his settlement in Ireland.

him could for a moment doubt. It was mainly through his instrumentality that a considerable portion of the Scriptures—a work of his own on the Evidences of Christianity, and a volume of Sacred Poetry—were introduced. For years he laboured diligently to carry out the system in its integrity; and it was only when, as it appeared to him, the system had been infringed, and the public broken faith with, by the withdrawal of books deliberately sanctioned by the Directors, and to whose circulation they had pledged themselves, that he withdrew from a work he could no longer conscientiously carry on.

How the system would have worked, and whether its success would have been greater as a *mixed* system, had the great body of Protestant clergy and laity in Ireland generally supported it, it would now be vain to enquire. That the results would have been different from those which have taken place can scarcely be doubted; but *what* those results would have been is another question. Whether a mixed system of education (really and not *nominally* mixed, as has been the case in some instances), can ever work effectively in a country where differing religious systems are held with such intensity as in Ireland, is in itself a question not easily or quickly answered; and what the effect would be on the religious life of either side, could it really and fairly be carried out, it might even be harder to decide. But these pages are not the place for such discussions, and, probably, they may be more fairly and clearly viewed many years hence.

For the actual history of the struggle as it did take place, we must refer the reader to the letters before us; the object of this work being not to chronicle political or social changes, but, as much as possible, to let its subject speak for himself.

It may suffice then to observe that on this point—one which at the time engrossed much of the general interest and attention—the great mass of the Irish clergy and their diocesan were in direct antagonism ; and the result of this could hardly fail to be a painful estrangement and misunderstanding, which, though softened in later years, could scarcely be fully overcome. Many truly conscientious men on both sides—who perhaps, under other circumstances, might have seen that the differences which separated them were less really deep-rooted than appeared at first—were led into a position of permanent antagonism, which prevented co-operation even where they might have laboured together with mutual advantage.

Other circumstances occurred which tended to keep up the separation. On the subject of National Judgments, as we have already observed, the Archbishop's views differed widely from those of leading men among his clergy ; and he was not one to compromise what he held to be truth, or to pass lightly over what he esteemed mischievous and erroneous. Several other matters, which need not here be enlarged on, tended unfortunately to increase the same estrangement.

To all the array of prejudice against him, the Archbishop brought a resolute mind, an uncompromising love of truth and determination to carry out thoroughly all he felt to be right, and manners which had more of the ease and freedom, and perhaps abruptness, of the Oriel Common-room than the cautious, stately, and measured courtesy generally expected in high dignitaries of the Church. The true elements of courtesy, in its highest sense—a delicate regard for the feelings of others, and a disinterested benevolence which has seldom been equalled—he did, indeed, possess. But the remains of the old shyness, added to the somewhat didactic tone naturally

acquired by a college-tutor and lecturer, left a certain peculiarity of manner, which was often mistaken by those who knew him little.

To those with whom he was now brought into contact it was wholly unintelligible, and they misjudged him accordingly. Many truly good men never through life fully understood the real character of him with whom they had to do. He was unlike any they had been used to meet; and his profound reserve on the subjects on which he really thought most deeply (while open, even to transparency, on others), led them to form the hasty conclusion, that the sentiments which were not expressed as they had been accustomed to express them, did not exist.

But if it were thus possible even for conscientious and pious men so utterly to misunderstand their diocesan, it may easily be believed that in their train followed many of a lower stamp—many to whom a single-minded and conscientious man was alike unintelligible and hateful—many who abused him, without knowing why, merely to please those whom they thought it their interest to conciliate; and the popular journals of the day poured forth articles, in the most vehement and often scurrilous language, opposing all the measures, principles, and practices of their new diocesan in unmeasured terms of bitterness.

He met all this opposition calmly and firmly. He never swerved a hairbreadth from the course he had laid down. But opposition was painful to his disposition. His earlier life, as we have remarked, had been spent among attached friends, and admiring and respectful pupils; the contrast could not but be bitterly felt, even by a nature endowed with less deep and acute feelings than his. He passed through the fiery ordeal with all the natural courage of his character.

\* But he did not restrain himself, either in his speeches

in Parliament or in his correspondence, from complaints which showed how severely this trial wrought on his sensitive nature. He might, no doubt, have been more reticent on this subject, and have shared with other public men the amount of obloquy and misrepresentation which forms the ordinary allowance of English public life. But he was by nature undoubtedly a little prone to indulge in feelings of mortification of this class; and it must also be remembered that his case was peculiar. Most public men are connected with others by the strong ties of party. On men so linked together, the storm of contumelious assault bursts comparatively harmless. ‘*Defendit numerus, junctæque umbone phalanges.*’ To attack one is to attack all. Every one is certain, in his hour of need, not merely of generous but of interested and almost instinctive support from his political clansmen. But Whately stood alone. By his firm and deliberate choice he had severed himself from all party connexions; he lost, therefore, all the advantage of party sympathy and support. Of course he was not abandoned, either in debate or in action; he had a few attached friends, and he was also defended on necessary occasions by his immediate chiefs, of whom Lord Grey, according to his nature, was among the most generous. Still, generally speaking, he was left alone in the unpopularity which circumstances forced on him: and this must be borne in mind, if his complaints on the subject appear at times to indicate that he was not ‘*tetragono ai colpi di ventura.*’\*

In this year (1832) Archbishop Whately founded the Professorship of Political Economy which bears his name in the University of Dublin. This was an enterprise attended with considerable difficulty, owing to the general ignorance of the subject in the University. It was hard to prevent

those to whom the science was new from imagining that it had something to do with party politics, which, in his own words, ‘had about as much to do with political economy as they had with manufactures or agriculture.’

The establishment, however, of this professorship, and the distinguished talents of the eminent men who have succeeded each other in the chair—of whom the first three were Isaac Butt, Esq., M.P.; James A. Lawson, Esq., Solicitor-General; and the Right Hon. Judge Longfield—could not but produce a considerable effect in leading to a clearer comprehension of the aims and objects of the science.

When, fifteen years later, the Dublin Statistical Society was founded, the Archbishop thus alluded to the subject, in his address at the conclusion of the first session. I quote the report : —

‘When he spoke of the satisfaction he felt on this occasion, he could not but advert to the attention, zeal, and exertions of the University Professors in assisting in the cultivation and diffusion of this important science. To them the Society owed much of its success. . . . . Let them look back on the state of things previous to the establishment of the Professorship of Political Economy in their University. Very few thought at all of the subject, and the few who did think of it entertained fallacious and erroneous notions relative to it. As for himself, as in connection with the subject, he considered himself but as removed from the University of Oxford to that of Dublin; and when, on leaving that place, he retired from the chair of Political Economy, he was of opinion that a chair should also be established in the Dublin University. . . . But at that time the prevailing want of generally diffused knowledge on the subject—and this he said to the credit of the University for creating a professorship of a science of which there was no cultivation—was such, that he

hardly dared hope to succeed in finding a person well qualified to fill the office.' . . 'The matter,' continued the Archbishop, 'was left to me, and I consented that it should be so, on condition that I should submit certain questions with reference to the science, in writing, to the several candidates, who were to reply under symbolical names, I being in perfect ignorance of the names of the candidates. This was done; and to my surprise I found that there were no less than three candidates at the first election, whom I found perfectly competent to undertake the duty, and fill creditably the chair of Political Economy. I said to my surprise, because I knew that this science did not form any part of the collegiate course at this time. I pursued a similar course at each subsequent vacancy, and the difficulty was found to be not whether any of the candidates were competent, but which was the most competent. I may add, I did not know if there were Englishmen or members of an English University among the candidates; but it is certain that Irishmen were elected in every case, though Englishmen were not excluded.'

This was not the only respect in which the Archbishop's influence was beneficially felt in Trinity College. It was principally to his exertions (combined with those of a few distinguished members of the University) that it has owed the increased attention and care bestowed of late years on the study of the Greek Testament.

But while ever ready to turn his attention to questions like these, the Archbishop continued to labour in his diocese as he had laboured in his parish and college—reforming abuses of long standing, and carrying a spirit of diligent and unwearied activity into every department. The rite of Confirmation, which had not been administered for many years in the diocese, was revived; he adopted the plan of

holding confirmations alternately in different churches and districts regularly in every other year, sometimes oftener, requiring a very careful preparation for it. He made the ceremony a deeply impressive and touching one, not only by the solemn dignity and deep feeling with which he performed it, but by the custom, to which he ever adhered, of beginning and ending it by a short but impressive address to the young people, and following it up by the administration of the Lord's Supper. This he considered especially important, as affording the candidates an opportunity of partaking of a privilege which might otherwise be long delayed or altogether neglected; and he strongly upheld the principle that Confirmation should ever be regarded as a *preparation* for the Lord's Table, and that those who are unfit for the one are unfit for the other. The ordinations were likewise conducted in very different manner from what had been practised before. Instead of leaving the task of examination to his chaplain, he took this office into his own hands; but to avoid the painful alternative of himself dismissing a candidate, or accepting one who might be unfit, he caused them all to pass through preliminary examinations conducted by his chaplains, sometimes frequently repeated; the chaplains being charged to allow no one to come up to the Archbishop for the *final* examination, unless he was certain to pass.

His weekly levées were another distinguishing feature in his diocesan work. All who wished to see him on business attended these levées, and they were often made an occasion for much instructive and interesting conversation, when, with a circle of clergy around him, he would propose questions or discuss various subjects with characteristic liveliness and fertility of mind.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A luncheon was regularly provided at these levées, plain, but substantial and plentiful; and the attendance of servants was excluded, to enable all who wished, to partake of refreshment without scruple or shyness.

The following incident occurred on one of the Archbishop's confirmation tours. While on a visit at the house of one of his clergy, a large party was assembled to meet him. After dinner the conversation turned on the Apostolic decree, about 'abstinence from blood,' &c., which some present were disposed to regard as binding on us. The Archbishop, according to a frequent custom of his, stated various questions and raised objections to each suggestion, in order to draw out his companions. One of the guests, a layman, seeing that all appeared a good deal puzzled, imagined that the Archbishop himself was at a loss, and that he avoided giving a decision from not knowing precisely what to think. He accordingly called on the Archbishop for explanation, in a manner which seemed to imply some doubt whether he would be able to give it. The latter calmly replied that he had only wished to ascertain the views of the clergy present, but that, if they wished it, he had no objection to give his own. He then proceeded to sketch out the system of St. Paul; that he would not allow any persons to change one way or the other, on becoming Christians, except by observing that pure morality which really does constitute part of the Christian character; in all externals, 'let every man continue in his vocation wherewith he is called.' So that he concluded the abstinence from blood and things strangled to be merely the continuance of it among the 'devout' Gentiles, who had *already* practised it, and to be *imposed* on none. This view, which the Archbishop has brought forward in several of his works, he sketched out in a continuous discourse of ten or fifteen minutes, and so clearly and intelligibly that there was an involuntary murmur of approbation through the company. The gentleman who had called for the explanation said nothing more.

An anecdote of one of his early levées is thus recorded by one of his clergy :—

‘Upon one occasion,’ writes this gentleman, ‘a prelate, since deceased, was present, whose views were not favourable to the doctrine of Election. “My Lord,” said he, addressing the Archbishop, “it appears to me that the young clergy of the present day are more anxious to teach the people high doctrine than to enforce those practical duties which are so much required.” “I have no objection,” said his Grace, “to high doctrine, if high practice be also insisted upon—otherwise it must of course be injurious.” Then, addressing the young clergy who were present, he said, “My younger brethren, if at any time you find your preaching productive of good, and that your congregations value your exertions, beware of being puffed-up and losing your balance ! Self-respect is valuable and useful, but as there will be a sufficient growth each day, cut it close every morning. And when through the goodness of God you are successful in your ministry, enter into your closet, fall down on your knees before the throne, and to the Lamb ascribe all the praise, the honour, and the glory.”’

The monthly dinners were another important feature in the Archbishop’s work in his diocese. They were held regularly for the members of the Dublin ‘Association for Discountenancing Vice.’ The members, both clergy and laity (clergy, however, naturally predominating), were invited by turns to these dinners ; there was no constraint or formality, all conversed freely, and those who were present often recall with undying interest the brilliant and instructive conversation they enjoyed there.

These meetings were peculiarly congenial to the Archbishop’s disposition, and furnished him with the kind of society he most enjoyed.

The following reminiscences from Bishop Hinds will furnish additional particulars of his early work in Dublin. Dr. Hinds writes:—‘I accompanied him on his first Confirmation tour. One of the stations was Athy, where he was hospitably entertained by Mr. Trench, and a great number of the neighbouring clergy invited to meet him. Whilst waiting for dinner a conversation was going on, with him and around him, on a public controversy that had been held between some Roman Catholics and some members of our communion, and on the manner in which the several questions at issue had been handled by the two parties. “Gentlemen,” said the Archbishop, “suppose I take the Roman Catholic side for a few minutes, and you argue against me; I should like to hear how you would proceed.” Into the debate they all plunged, the Archbishop standing, like one of Ariosto’s knights, opposed to a throng who thrust right and left without being able to make a rent in his armour. Dinner put an end to the conflict, but so sensible were the clergy of having been left in an awkward position, that, when we returned to the drawing-room, a deputation presented themselves, to express a hope that, as he had so powerfully advocated the Roman Catholic cause, he would give them the benefit of pointing out what there was weak in his arguments, and how they ought to be met. This he did, with his accustomed kindness and clearness.

‘He was careful on all occasions to disavow his connection with any political party; but this principle of entire independence was hardly understood, and in more instances than one, probably, he disappointed the expectations of those who supposed that they had some party claims on him. At the Lord-Lieutenant’s, one day, the conversation turned on the censure the Government was incurring for what was represented as truckling to

O'Connell. The Archbishop took no part in the discussion. At length Lord Plunket said to him—thinking, no doubt, to elicit from him a word or two of approval—"Archbishop, you do not tell us what you think; may not one make use of the services of another, without being identified with him, or being responsible for all his opinions and conduct?" *The Archbishop*: "I would make use of Satan himself if I could make any good use of him, *but*," added he with emphasis, and an emphatic look, "*I would not pay him his price.*"

'In connection with what he did in Parliament and by his writings for improving the Poor Laws, may be mentioned his uniform protest against the practice of giving alms in the street. During his residence in Oxford he was an active member of a society established there for the suppression of mendicity, &c., and took his turn regularly at the office in Carfax, when the indigent travellers were brought up from the lodging-houses to receive their morning meal and a small sum of money, and to be put on their route out of the town. On these occasions he took infinite pains to ascertain, as far as possible, who were mere vagrants, and who not. Some amusing incidents occurred. It had been found expedient to require that they should present themselves with clean faces, and the men shaved. A long beard being a useful appendage for disguise, and for making up a professional beggar, against the latter part of this regulation many strenuous appeals were made. Whately was most obdurate; breakfast or beard was the hard alternative, not a few choosing to hold to the latter. Another requirement was that they should show the contents of their pockets. One, on being called to do so, drew out a MS., and politely presented it for inspection. It turned

out to be a poem, the man's own composition—subject, *The Treadmill*.

‘In Dublin he had to deal with a new phase of mendicancy. The mendicant in Ireland, covered as he is with shreds of clothing for which there is no vocabulary, a spectacle of poverty in its lowest and saddest form, is, nevertheless, not the mere *beggar* as in England, but has at command a fund of wit and pleasantry to serve his turn, where his moving tale and miserable appearance fail him. Here again the Archbishop, whilst he took a warm interest in the Dublin Mendicity Association, set his face as firmly as ever against street alms. Soon after his arrival we were walking on the Donnybrook road, when a sturdy fellow followed him persistingly, and would take no denial. He whined and beclamoured, was pathetic, was humorous, but all to no purpose. At length, as if he had given up the attempt to get anything, he dropped a little behind, and said in an undertone, taking care however that it should be audible, “What a handsome pair of legs he has!” On went the Archbishop; the man gave him up as impracticable.

‘He used to boast that he had never in his life given to a beggar in the street or highway—a boast that was the more allowable, as it is well known that his purse was ever open for relieving distress, and that “to do good and to distribute” was one prominent trait in his character.’

The following letter, to Mr. Senior, is on another subject which through life greatly occupied his mind, that of Transportation, and respecting which much more will be found in these pages.

‘My dear Senior,—

. . . . .

‘The evils of different erroneous laws will sometimes so

balance each other that, till one of them is amended, the full mischief of the other shall not be developed. A new piece put into an old garment makes the rent worse.

‘Now I conceive that there is a great number of persons in this country, who, though not very scrupulous, and though inveterately idle (thanks to our legal encouragements), abstain from crime, because they can live in ease and plenty without it, the condition of a convict being in some respects a little worse, and in others but a little better, than that of a pauper. / If these men are suddenly pulled up, and find the life of a pauper a disagreeable drudgery, much worse than the hulks, the dockyards, or Botany Bay, what is to preserve us from the stream of delinquency which will break forth ?

‘Again, if it be recommended as an occasional relief from the pressure of distress in individuals and in parishes to authorize *emigration* under a bond of apprenticeship, namely, so that a man should be simply maintained in a colony till he should have worked out his cost of passage, one great objection to this, in most respects, very eligible expedient is, that such is, to all practical purposes, the (so-called) penalty of transportation ; for the convict who is tolerably steady for a few years, always obtains his liberty, and can then earn very high wages.

‘It may be said, you have nothing to do with legislation out of your own departments ; but surely you are competent and bound to state the impediments to such a system as you on the whole recommended, when those impediments are such as an act of the Legislature can remove.

‘I wrote to Hinds the same day as to you. It may, perhaps, be worth while just to notice in two sentences a difficulty you suggested in the application of his scheme to colonies having much waste land—namely, that a negro

would prefer squatting on an uncleared spot to working for hire. If, however, all the land in the colonies were appropriated by the local government, no negro would be able thus to take possession of land in the immediate vicinity, at least of the settled parts, without paying for it a price, which might be handed over as a compensation to his master.

‘Some, indeed, might retire far back into the wilds; but few, especially of the more civilized negroes, and such as would be likely to obtain freedom the earliest, would like to banish themselves far from the estate they had been used to regard as their home, unless very illused.

‘I understand that their local attachments are very strong.

‘I wish you would get your brother to wind up his novel,<sup>1</sup> or else publish first *one volume*; and if that should be well received, it would be a stimulus to complete the rest. This last idea I wonder had never struck me. I like it the best.

‘Ever yours truly,

‘R. WHATELY.’

The following letter to Lord Grey on Church matters explains itself:—

‘Dublin: May 2, 1832.

‘My dear Lord,—If in what I am about to say I am guilty of impertinent presumption, your lordship’s appointment of me, and the manner in which it was made, must plead my excuse.

‘How much soever your lordship may be thought to

<sup>1</sup> This was the tale alluded to before, written as a kind of vehicle for description of Colonel Senior’s experiences in the West Indies and South America, on which he had collected much interesting and valuable information. It was published many years later, under the title of ‘Charles Vernon.’

have overrated my qualifications, no one can doubt the truth of what you professed, that you were influenced by no personal or party motives, since in fact none could have a place, but purely by a desire of appointing one who might be fitted to meet the difficult and momentous crisis of the Church.

‘That a most extensive ecclesiastical reformation (or deformation, as it may turn out) *will* ere long take place I cannot doubt. When and by whom the change will be introduced, and of what character, and with what results, must depend chiefly on the conduct of the leading members of the Establishment.

‘The sagacious forethought—the mildness combined with firmness—the boldness guided by discretion—the thoroughgoing and disinterested zeal, without any wild enthusiasm,—all the qualities, in short, which such an emergency calls for, are seldom united in one man; and yet one man possessing them all in the highest degree, could do but little unless there were others on the Bench to co-operate with him.

‘But some very good men think themselves *bound* to resist, to the last, all alterations, even should they be certain of ultimate defeat; some, again, are strongly blind to the state of things; and some are alarmed indeed, but alarmed like a horse in a stable on fire, which cannot be brought to submit to be rescued.

‘In presuming to point out, either now or on any future occasion, any one to your lordship’s notice as qualified to fill hereafter a place on the Bench, I beg to be understood as adhering to my resolution, of never *asking* anything, either for myself or my friends; which I could never do, even if I had, which I have not, any claim upon a Minister. However presumptuous and however erroneous any *recommendation* of mine may be,

I pledge myself never to make any except on purely public grounds.' . . . .

*Extract of a letter to Mr. Senior on Ecclesiastical Government.*

‘The following remarks apply to all governments, whether civil or ecclesiastical, though I have in view at present only the latter :—

‘Most governments have in them, somewhere or other, an *absolute* power, one which may make any enactment whatever, and consequently may subvert the existing constitution. *E.g.*, an Act of Parliament might pass which should give to the Royal Proclamation the force of a law, and thus invest the King with despotic power ; or again, which should reduce him to the condition of a Doge of Venice.

‘Some newly-formed States have dreaded to intrust to any man or body this unlimited power, and have in the original scheme of the constitution *fixed* certain fundamental points as out of the control of the Legislature. This is the case with the United States of America. The government is limited by the original constitution, and if the Congress should pass any act encroaching on that, no citizen would be bound to obey such a law. The disadvantage of this is, that it places the present generation under the control of their ancestors, and provides no legal method for their throwing it off, even should they unanimously wish to do so. Should a great majority of the citizens of the United States agree with the legislature in wishing for such a change, we may be sure they would effect it, though they would not do so regularly.

‘The problem is to devise a mode of escaping *both* disadvantages ; and this can only be effected by providing for

the calling in, from time to time, some new power, distinct from the ordinary legislature, and authorised to introduce changes from which the other is restricted. The Roman decemvirs and dictators were something approaching to such a provision, but the chief error of those contrivances was the allowing these provisional governments to *superse*de the ordinary, and to engross the *whole* power of the state. Hence they led to tyrannical usurpation. They should have had no other power than that which was *peculiar* to them.

‘The best contrivance of the kind is, I think, the constitution of some colleges in respect of their *visitors*. The Master and Fellows, &c., govern and make byelaws under certain restrictions; but, with respect to alterations of fundamental statutes, have no power except to call in the Visitor, who has power, when thus appealed to, to alter the statutes, and having done so retires, and leaves the ordinary government in the same hands as before.

‘It is on this plan I should proceed if I were employed to frame for any community, civil or religious, a constitution of government.

‘The principle is equally applicable to all forms, whether monarchical, aristocratical, popular, or in any way mixed. Provision should be made for calling in what might be called a *visitatorial* power on extraordinary emergencies. The constitution originally laid down should bind the *ordinary* government, which should administer, under these limitations, the affairs of the community. It should have no power to alter any of the fundamental rules of the constitution, but should be authorised, whenever its members thought fit, to summon the extraordinary assembly (or whatever it might be called), for which provision should have been made. And this assembly should have no power except to deliberate and decide

on the points proposed to it by the ordinary legislature ; it should not supersede or interfere with their authority, and should be dissolved at any time, even *re infectâ* at their pleasure. In short, it should be precisely the *regulator* of a watch.

‘It is, I think, thus and thus only that we can avoid the two opposite evils—of too strict a confinement to the decisions of our ancestors, when, even if originally the best, they may have ceased to be suitable ; and of rash and ruinous changes of constitution, an evil which is very apt to succeed the other.’

*Letter to Lord Grey.*

‘Dublin : May 19, 1832.

‘My dear Lord,—I fear your lordship may think that the kindness with which you have listened to me has encouraged me to be obtrusive ; but I cannot forbear, under existing circumstances, interceding in behalf of my clergy, and begging that the Relief Bill<sup>1</sup> may proceed. Some of them, it must be owned, are more disposed to complain that more is not done for them than to avail themselves of what is offered ; but many, I am certain, will gladly accept what they can get ; and many, even of such as had flattered themselves they should obtain great advantages from a change of ministry, will *now*, after finally abandoning that hope, gradually adopt more reasonable views.

‘If such an arrangement of the executive government is completed, as I fully anticipate, it will be a difficult but a great and glorious feat for your lordship’s ministry to

<sup>1</sup> The measure for advancing to the Irish clergy of the Established Church the arrears of tithe which they had been unable to collect, by a grant of a million, repayable under certain conditions.

preserve the Establishment from utter overthrow. So much power will have been shown by, and influence claimed by, that portion of the population to whom, unhappily, the Bishops have rendered themselves excessively obnoxious, that I fear you will feel yourselves in the condition of a general who has taken a town by storm, and is at a loss to keep his troops from plundering and burning. And the House of Lords, always regarded as the stronghold of the Church Establishment, will now, I fear, be unable to afford effectual support, or effectual opposition to anything. It seems to me that a large creation of peers is wanted for it—not, now, for the sake of carrying the Reform Bill, but for the purpose of restoring the House itself to the confidence of the country, by an infusion into it of some popular elements—by strengthening it in the public favour, through the addition of a considerable number of men who are regarded as sympathizing with the nation. To preserve either that House or the Church Establishment, in such a state of things as the late contest will have produced, will be a difficult problem; and the difficulty is one which I cannot but admit the bishops have had a very great share in producing. In case of your lordship's reinstatement in office, which every one here now fully anticipates, I take the liberty of submitting the enclosed paper, relative to a point of the highest importance as far as I can judge.<sup>1</sup> The writer, Dr. Hinds, my chaplain, submitted it first to the Chancellor, but I know not whether his lordship's avocations allowed him to pay attention to it. And, at all events, the state of things is now different from what it was when the paper was drawn up, about a year ago; and, as it seems to me, far more favourable to the accom-

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 84-86, 'Proposal for the Gradual Abolition of Slavery.'

plishment of the object. If matters take such a turn as I fully anticipate, the ministry would have no need to apprehend defeat or difficulty in bringing in such a bill as suggested. In fact, they will be able just at this crisis to do almost what they will. And what a glory, and an appropriate glory, would it be for the same party who formerly succeeded in making the slave-trade illegal, now to adopt a measure which will effect what I am satisfied no other could—sap the foundation of slavery, and finally extinguish it, not by ruining but by relieving the distressed planters, and not by leaving the negroes in the state of barbarism, as at Hayti, from which they may not recover for ages, but by preparing them to endure and to employ liberty! Generations yet unborn would, I am sure, bless the memory of the men who should solve this great problem, which the most mature deliberation has convinced me can be solved in this way, and in no other.

‘If your lordship thinks fit to communicate on the subject with my friend Senior, he is fully master of the plan, and agrees with me in thinking it dictated by consummate wisdom. He and I are much connected with West Indians, and familiar with their affairs. The writer is a native of Barbadoes, and a man of clearer judgment or more free from every bias of prejudice I never knew.

‘The additional members which it is purposed to add would, I think, be rather an advantage than not to the House.

‘They would have, like others, their prejudices and party feelings, but quite distinct from those of the rest; they could not be suspected as adding to the weight of the democratical or of the aristocratical interest. In many questions which call forth much self-interested prejudice, they, though perhaps equally prejudiced in

their own way, would be impartial judges. Contemplating the matter in all its bearings, it does seem to me that an opportunity *now* offers itself which may never recur, of saving a large portion of the (half) civilized world from sinking, after scenes of unspeakable misery, into a state of perhaps permanent barbarism.

‘Accept my apologies for thus intruding on your lordship’s valuable time, and believe me, &c.’

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

‘Dublin: May 14, 1832.

‘Here, as well as elsewhere, we are of course in a state of much anxiety about the Bill<sup>1</sup> and the ministers. I myself should be very glad to have a reform considerably different from the proposed one, but I feel a little doubt that the time for it is irrecoverably past. The people have no confidence (nor can I blame them) in those who opposed all reform as long as they could, and now are preparing their vaccination when the smallpox has broken out. If the Bill had been thrown out in the Commons, there would have been a hope; but when it has passed an *unreformed* House of Commons, and one, it may be said, elected expressly for the purpose of trying the question, the people will never, I think, endure the vote of the Lords. If a Tory ministry should come in, and dissolve the House, I shall anticipate the late scenes in Paris. And the worst of it is, whatever turn things take, I can see nothing that bodes well to the Church Establishment; I fear its days are numbered.

‘By-the-bye, —— has replied, I find (in conversation), to my letter, by taxing me with inconsistency,

<sup>1</sup> The Reform Bill.

in saying that this attack, even if true, would have been inexpedient, whereas I have maintained in my works that expediency ought not to be preferred to truth. This, I suppose, is meant as a jest, by way of casting ridicule on my whole notion of recommending a scrupulous adherence to truth; for I have often remarked the bitter scorn with which this is perpetually alluded to by that party. According to him, I maintain, it seems, that any one who may chance to have an ill opinion of his neighbour is bound to proclaim it on all occasions, and without any occasion at all, without regard either to expediency or common decency. Neither he nor any one else can really believe me to have said anything so absurd. It is no compromise of truth to keep silence on some occasions; but I do maintain that to take advantage of a man's absence to misrepresent him, because it appears expedient to lessen his influence, is an unjustifiable compromise of truth, and in the present instance I think it was an unwise one.

‘I have not the least doubt, however, of the sincerity of his commendations of me, which I am so far from thinking inconsistent with his attack on me, that I believe his good opinion of me had a great deal to do with it. An independent man, firmly keeping clear of all parties, is, if not deficient in ability or in activity, much more formidable to a regular politician than even a partisan of the opposite side, especially if less conscientious. The politician would esteem less, but would also dread and dislike less, one whom he might have a prospect of hereafter enlisting on his side—one weak enough to be deluded, or cowardly enough to be bullied, or dishonest enough to be bribed by personal consideration, into an abandonment of his principles.’

The next letters, on a very different subject, are highly characteristic. They are addressed to a former parishioner, with whom he maintained through life a correspondence which was valued and enjoyed by both parties. He was at this time anxious to induce this friend to employ her talents in writing for the young; and this forms the chief part of the two letters before us, which we have placed together for this reason:—

‘Dublin : June 29, 1832.

‘My dear Miss Crabtree,—I send you two sketches, which I have not time to fill up, and one or both of which may set you agoing. There is difference enough between them to give scope to different turns of mind. Write just as your own taste prompts, departing as far from the sketch as you please, for you will never write well if shackled. I am inclined to think you may make a good writer for children and the lower orders—the most important and not the easiest department. You may learn “enough of medicine to cure a little child,” but remember “you must spoil before you spin.” You must have the patience to write and not please yourself, and try again and again without being disheartened, or you must not calculate on ultimate success; at least I know what pains it cost me. But never think of writing well while you are about it; write rapidly after having thought maturely, and then lay it by for a day or two, and try to improve it. You have no idea of the patient modesty with which I have always laboured to profit by the criticisms of friends and enemies, without being discouraged. Perhaps you despise allegory. So do I. It is not for philosophers, but there is nothing like it for the vulgar and children. Thank you for a most interesting letter.

‘Send me your first attempt soon.’

‘Dublin : Sept. 20, 1832.

‘My dear Miss Crabtree,—You may have thought I had forgotten you, but I have seldom a day or an hour to spare. It will do you much more service to correct and recast your own composition than to have it done for you; and as you have learnt to draw, you will, I trust, feel no mortification or disappointment or impatience at rubbing out and retouching, again and again, every stroke till it is quite right. No one will ever learn to draw or to compose well who will not submit to this drudgery. But in composition there are many who are ashamed to own the pains they have in fact taken, because they wish to be thought to owe everything to native genius. There may be such geniuses, but I at least am not one. I shall make some use, I cannot yet say what, of the “Settlement;” the other I send back for the reason above given, with some remarks to guide you in recasting it. The species of composition, though when well done it seems very easy, is one of the most difficult, but I think you will succeed in it if you will take pains. The usual source of failure in everything of an allegorical nature, is not keeping up the allegory, but letting “Snug the Joiner” peep through the lion’s neck and tell the company he is not really a lion. You may find numberless instances in that most popular allegory, the “Pilgrim’s Progress,” in which the travellers talk about sin and a Christian life while they are marching along the road and bear burdens on their backs; the author forgetting that the sin had already been represented by the burden, and the Christian life by the road. The difficulty of steadily holding on the mask, is what no one hardly could believe who has not tried. And, after all, what a “mean” employment of the intellectual powers, to write for the instruction and amusement of the vulgar and children—that is, for three-fourths of mankind, and for

half the remainder ! I continue as well as I can expect to be, considering the harassing business I have to go through. I expect to be in London the ensuing winter, to “fight with wild beasts” in Parliament. All the storms I have hitherto encountered are nothing to what I expect will then rage against me ; but I believe the crisis of the Church to be at hand, and that my Master calls me to tread the raging waves.’

*To N. Senior, Esq.—On Secondary Punishments.*

‘Dublin : July 2.

‘I wish you would get me the reports of the Tithe Committee. I have had none of them.

‘I should like Chadwick to turn on his mind this addition to his suggestions : At Alban Hall, where I was at a loss for secondary punishments, I used to enter a delinquent’s name in a black book, where he stood as a kind of *debtor*, to be punished only if he appeared a second or third time, and then for all together. Might not a tattooed mark on the side of the foot, or somewhere out of sight, be the punishment in some cases ? The men on a second conviction would suffer for both offences.

‘Pray suggest, in your report on paupers, that any female receiving relief should have her hair cut off ; it may seem trifling, but *hæ nugæ*, &c. 1st. A good head of hair will fetch from 5s. to 10s., which would be perhaps a fortnight’s maintenance. 2nd. Indirectly, the number who would exert themselves to save their hair is beyond belief. One of our maids is ill of a fever, and we have almost been driven to force to make her part with her hair, though her life is in danger. I am certain she would have cheerfully worked and fared hard for any length of time to save it.’

*To the Hon. Mr. Stanley, Secretary for Ireland.*

‘Dublin: July 8, 1832.

‘My dear Sir,—I will trespass so far on your kindness as to beg you to transmit the enclosed memorial,<sup>1</sup> together with an application from myself.

‘I shall be thought, perhaps, to make more stir than enough about a trifling matter. The proposed *saving* is indeed a trifle, but it is possible for a great deal of good-will, and far more of ill-will, to turn on a very small sum.

‘That the present government look with an evil eye on the clergy of the Established Church, and wish to stint, discourage, and depress them in every way, is a notion which, among violent party-men indeed, no reasonable measures could at once remove; but this is far from being a reason why, unnecessarily, anything like just grounds should be afforded for such a complaint, by cutting off from a poor, a very much-respected, and very efficient person, a sum too trifling to government to be an object to *them*, but of great consequence to *him*. Several influential persons, who know his deserts and his circumstances, regard his case as one of great hardship, the more as he is infirm in health, disqualified for many situations, and yet, as I can testify, exceedingly efficient where he is.

‘I have no personal interest in him whatever, and speak only on general grounds. “Then if the Archbishop thinks so much of the matter,” it will perhaps be answered, “why does he not pay the odd £25 out of his own pocket, and not tease us any more about it?”

<sup>1</sup> On a special case, in which a part of a chaplain’s salary had been cut off.

‘Now, this is precisely the point I am coming to, and to which the application I have to make relates.

‘I am ready to pay the money myself; but if this is done *as from myself*, though the pecuniary distress of Mr. —— will be relieved, the sense of *wrong* cannot be removed from his mind, and from that of the governors who are interested in his behalf; and the unfavourable impression respecting the procedure of government would be rather heightened. If I were a “conservative,” I don’t know that I could think of a better step than to pay this defalcation of salary, assigning the cause.

‘*My* request, therefore, is that the commissioners will accede to Mr. ——’s application, and allow *me* to pay over to them the annual £25, saying nothing about the transaction, which I will take care to conceal. These are not times in which, even if I were hostile to the administration, I should like to gain credit at the expense of government, when all its credit and all its strength are wanted to keep the country from civil war. I will not therefore complain, whatever may be the result of this application; though I must feel, in the event of its being rejected, that I shall have been uncourteously used; since I am ready not only to sacrifice my own money to save an individual from hardship, but to sacrifice my own credit also (which many would prize still more) to save the credit of government.

‘P.S.—Permit me to express the great satisfaction I feel in reading the reports of your speeches, which appear to me more uniformly the result of strong sense and right feeling than almost any others, however oratorically beautiful. The testimony must always be worth something of a man who has nothing to look to that any ministry can give, and who, when poor and unfriended, was well known to have never deigned to flatter.’

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

‘Dublin : July 30, 1832.

‘My dear Lord,—I am tired—I have been tired—I shall be tired—I may be tired, &c., &c., &c. I have got through twenty-three confirmations, and have two more to come ; but I will write what occurs to me without premeditation.

‘I have had the *amusement* of hearing an examination (one day of it) for the Trinity College fellowships ; it is very strange to us Oxford men, and, *we* should think, very absurd—being in Latin, all oral, and all the candidates together, jostling each other. It was a matter of curiosity to hear for the first time an examination in my (I should rather say our) Logic.

‘I do not know what to think of the state of this country. Besides other difficulties, the English, who are in fact its legislators, do not understand the peculiarities of the people ; they are surrounded by those who wish to mislead them ; and when they meet with one who tells them the truth, they will not believe him. In particular, they will cling to the belief that Protestant *ascendancy*, or the ascendancy of some one party, would pacify the country, which, as I lately explained to you, could only be through the complete extermination of its opponents. As long as *any* of the adverse sect remained, the victors would never cease insulting and goading them, till they brought on a fresh rebellion ; and so there would be, as for the last six hundred years, a perpetual succession of battle, murder, and sudden death. But this is never adequately understood by the English nation, who are perhaps haughty and selfish governors of the vanquished, but not restless and wanton tormentors. A conquered enemy, of the English, is an ox yoked to the plough to

drudge; of the Irish, a bull tied to the stake to be baited.

‘Blanco<sup>1</sup> tells me you have had much intercourse in the way of business with ——, and find him clever and useful. I have sometimes had occasion, and probably shall very often, to transact business with men whom I cannot esteem; and it annoys me to find them, as I often do, better men of business than better men. I mean, that it tends to weaken the most desirable association between the ἀγαθόν and the χρήσιμον. When a man’s moral delinquencies have come across me personally, I am conscious of being tempted to disguise from myself personal resentment under the garb of virtuous indignation; afterwards, when time and circumstances have put me into a better humour, I feel the temptation to be towards a culpable indifference about what is intrinsically wrong. We are prone, first, to mistake zeal for our own glory for zeal in the cause of virtue, and afterwards to give ourselves credit for a forgiving temper when we are compromising right principle. I find this among the sorest temptations when one is much engaged in business.

‘Did I show you, or communicate to you, the substance of my correspondence, last winter, with the Archbishop of Canterbury? It relates to a matter which more and more occupies my thoughts as my appearance in Parliament approaches. The Church has been for one hundred years without any government, and in such a stormy season it will not go on much longer without a rudder. I earnestly wish, on every account, that he, or else some other bishop, could be induced to save me from coming forward in a manner most distressing to my feelings, as I must do if others will not.’

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. J. Blanco White. See p. 178.

*To Lord Grey.*

‘Dublin : Sept. 19, 1832.

‘I dare say your lordship has formerly often met with persons who, when you asked the question whether it is or is not desirable that some reform in Parliament should take place, have replied by asking, “Why, *what sort* of a reform would you propose?” and when you went into particulars, some valid or plausible objection might be raised against the details of any conceivable plan.

‘Now, it is my own private opinion that a considerable reform in many points is wanting in our Church; and that by obstinately refusing even to listen to any proposal of the kind, we fail to avail ourselves of the advantage Protestants possess over the Romish Church, which is hampered by the claim to infallibility, and cannot mend a fault, because she dares not confess it possible. We are preparing for ourselves a similar downfall; for supposing our faults to be, as I fully believe, of far less magnitude, they will be reckoned doubly inexcusable if we persist in them, while we all along profess not to be infallible.

‘Nevertheless, I shall not proceed, in the first instance, to propose any specific reform, or even any reform at all, but merely that the Church should have a government—viz., a certain body of men, whose acknowledged business shall be to legislate in ecclesiastical matters; not necessarily to introduce changes, but to declare deliberately, and with authority, that such-and-such changes are or are not needed.

‘At present there is none such. We are in fact at this moment under the government of our earlier convocations, of men who were dead and buried above a century ago. One may often hear men say, “It would be a good thing if so-and-so could be introduced, or if that and that could

be modified or laid aside ; ” but every one seems conscious that there is no one to do it. Our ancestors locked the door, and the key is lost. Some suppose the King in council to have this power. But he is in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, supreme; and as in the one, so in the other, his proclamation has not the force of a *law*. His supposed prerogative accordingly is never executed except in small matters, where I suppose it is not thought worth while to dispute whether its exercise is strictly legal or not—such as the appointing of occasional forms of prayer, &c. But if he were to take upon him to introduce heterodox prayers, or even a prayer for the Education Board in Ireland, we should find his prerogative disputed. Now, can that be called a government which is submitted to only in matters thought too insignificant to be worth disputing about? It is a rein which snaps the instant it is pulled.

‘Some, again, consider the King and Parliament to be the proper legislature of the Church. The *power* they certainly have, because they have *all* power. They *could* frame statutes for any of the colleges at Oxford, or pass an act regulating the public examinations for degrees. But neither those matters, nor the ecclesiastical concerns of the Church, do they seem ever to have regarded as the proper business of Parliament. Our ancestors, though they required the sanction of Parliament for anything that was to be made part of the law of the land, seem to have regarded ecclesiastical matters as the proper province of Convocation.

‘But I neither wish for the revival of the old convocation just as it formerly existed, nor will I propose any specific form of Church government. I shall only advocate the appointment of commissioners, to devise, digest, and submit to Parliament some form of government. I always

find that a measure is the better received for being (to use a homely metaphor) cut into mouthfuls.

‘First, let us inquire whether it is desirable that the Church should *have* a government; next, *who* shall propose a plan for that purpose; then, *what* form of government shall be adopted; afterwards, whether the government should introduce any changes into our Articles, Liturgy, &c., &c.; and lastly, what those changes should be. If the most perfect scheme that man or angels could devise should be brought forward at once, there would be endless cavils, about the manner of baking the bread, before the corn was sown.

‘Parliament will probably be jealous of any appearance of a wish to encroach on its powers. To the suggestions of such jealousy I shall be prepared to reply, “Take and exercise, if you think fit (though you have never done so hitherto), this power yourselves; if not, choose persons to whom you will delegate it; but do not play the dog in the manger, and stickle for retaining power and an office of which you make no use at all.” I myself should prefer a legislative body (call it synod, or convocation, or assembly), consisting of a mixture of lay and clerical members (as in the Scotch Kirk), with not more than two-thirds of either description. And I should prefer a federal government, like that of the United States, with as little as possible left to the central, and as much as possible to the diocesan or archidiaconal synods. I have always found that the less uniformity is enforced in minor points (which are those in which uniformity is of no consequence), the more concord there will usually be in spirit and in essential points. Men agree best, in common life, whose principles, education, and general characters coincide, but who are not strictly confined, as by living in the same house, to the same hours for rising and dining, the same

diet, the same temperature, &c. ; for in these matters men are almost sure to have some difference of taste, which lead to irritating annoyances and quarrels. As I have said, however, I will not publicly commit myself on any matters of detail. It is my earnest wish and hope to be spared from coming forward in this matter at all, except as the supporter of the proposal of some senior member of the bench ; but of this I am convinced, that if the Church is to stand, it must be brought forward, and that very soon, and by a bishop. If we do not begin within the Establishment, a beginning will be made for us from without ; and, if it is, I fear our days are numbered. To set fire, like the Indians, to the grass before us, is the only way to prevent the conflagration overtaking us.'

\*The opinions and the exertions of Archbishop Whately, in the matter of Secondary Punishments, form a distinct and important chapter in his life, and shall therefore receive a compendious notice at the outset. The subject has for the present lost its popular interest ; but it is one which, in the ordinary course of events, the exigencies of society are pretty sure at some future time to bring to the surface again. When the Archbishop's attention was drawn to the topic, transportation to New South Wales for various terms, from 'life' down to 'seven years,' was the ordinary secondary punishment for all serious offences below capital. On their arrival in the colony, the criminals were either employed on public works, or (and in the majority of cases) 'assigned' as labourers to free settlers, and engaged chiefly in pastoral occupation. Much complaint reached the mother-country, which chiefly bore on the inequality of this kind of punishment. It was alleged that it pressed with very different severity on different classes : while many led very easy lives, and became prosperous and rich,

others were subject to severe and oppressive discipline ; others, again, wasted life in mere discontented idleness. Many schemes were suggested for the improvement of the system. Whately's clear and dissecting logic stopped short of nothing but its total abolition. He persuaded himself that it was, of all punishments, the least deterrent to the offender here, the least reforming to the person undergoing it. He thought it also calculated to produce enormous evil, by peopling with a criminal race a new and attractive region of the world. He considered that under this system, government at home, and its agents abroad, had to accomplish what he denominated two inconsistent objects—the prosperity of the colony, and the suitable punishment of the convicts. His opinions can be studied in his publications on the subject, and in his evidence before the Transportation Committee of 1838, which was appointed mainly in consequence of the public feeling produced by his appeals. They are everywhere urged vigorously, and with that single-hearted honesty which was the mainspring of his power. But—as his nature was—he looked but little at other sides of the question ; his works may be consulted for plenty of evidence and argument against transportation, but will afford little assistance to those who are endeavouring to devise substitutes for it, or to solve the great general problem of secondary punishments. At the same time it may be observed that Whately (in the ‘London Review,’ 1829,) was the first to suggest that notion of sentencing convicts ‘to a certain amount of labour, instead of time,’ which was afterwards taken up by the prison reformer Maconochie, and which is considered by some to form the basis of the much-admired system of discipline of Irish prisons under Sir Walter Crofton.

The immediate result of the efforts of himself and those whose energies he directed was, however, only a reform in the system. Assignment was partially abolished—other devices in the way of employment and punishment substituted. The ill-success of these, and the flow of free emigration into Australia, produced a general dissatisfaction in the colonies with transportation under any shape. From 1851 to 1854 the question was much and acrimoniously debated between them and the mother-country; the gold discoveries then contributed to render its continuance impossible: it lasted a few years to Western Australia only, and is now abolished.\*

*To Sir T. Denman (then Attorney-General).—On Secondary Punishments.*

‘Dublin: Oct. 9, 1832.

‘Sir,—I beg you to be assured that I am much flattered at finding that my late publication<sup>1</sup> has attracted so much of the notice of so many eminent persons, including yourself. It is also gratifying to find that in so many important points we are fully or very nearly agreed, even in some where you seem to suppose otherwise: *e.g.*, it was never my design to advocate an equality of punishment for all offenders, or a difference depending solely on the difficulty of prevention; I always meant the *importance* of preventing each offence to be taken into account. If we were to prevent robbing of orchards by roasting alive every one convicted of it, we should purchase the preservation of fruit too dearly. In the two cases you suppose, of a starving man stealing a loaf, and a profligate reducing a worthy man to beggary, there is as much difference in the

<sup>1</sup> ‘On Secondary Punishment,’ 1832.

public evil of the two offences as in the moral turpitude of the offenders.

‘When I spoke, however, of the theory of punishment as being for prevention and not for retribution, I was not unaware that a certain degree of conformity to existing prejudices (which operate like the friction, resistance of the air, &c., in mechanics) must be admitted, in order to obtain the necessary sanction of public opinion. We must, like Solon, give men not the best laws, but the best they can be brought to receive. Still we should, as far as the case will admit, strive gradually to wean men from hurtful prejudices; and I know of few more hurtful, in a moral point of view, than that which tends towards the apportionment of punishment to the moral guilt of the offender, for it leads of course to the converse error of estimating the moral guilt by the punishment; and thus a most false and mischievous standard of morality is set up, inasmuch as there are so many important duties which human law cannot enforce, so many odious offences which it cannot at all, or more than very inadequately punish — such as ingratitude, meanness, selfishness, seduction of youth into vice, &c.

‘I am convinced that to the error in question may be traced almost the whole of *religious persecution*. No one who believes in his religion can well avoid regarding it as a moral offence to reject, or at least to impugn or to corrupt it. But as men advance in intelligence they become by degrees more and more capable of approaching to a right view of this subject. Even the progress of language shows this. The ancients did not speak of *inflicting* punishment and *suffering* punishment, but of taking vengeance, paying a penalty, &c.; it was dare pœnas—luere—solvere—and ulcisci, as a deponent (i.e. *middle* verb) to *take*, for oneself, satisfaction; and the deponent puniri

was softened down afterwards into the transitive *punire* ; so δοῦναι δίκην—τιμωρίαν παράσχειν. A mere savage thinks only of the past. As men advance towards civilization, they think more and more of the future, *i.e.*, of preventing future transgressions.

‘Your remarks on Transportation are as ingenious as I should have expected them to be ; and though it would have been of course more gratifying to me to have found you altogether of my opinion, it is some satisfaction to feel that the objections to my views which I have before me are likely to be—considered both as to themselves, and in respect to their author—the strongest, and probably the whole, of what can be urged on that side. For, though I do not deny that many of them have weight (and, indeed, there can hardly be a system so bad that nothing can be said for it, or so good that nothing can be said against it), yet all of them together seem to me much more than overbalanced by those of either of the articles printed in the Appendix. Some of these you seem to me to have overlooked : *e.g.*, what you say as to the *dislike* of transportation felt by many offenders is a topic discussed in p. 69, and in other parts of the same article ; the topic of “ getting rid ” of criminals, in p. 84, and again in p. 140 ; that of the overcharged expectations of comfort and prosperity in New South Wales, in pp. 76, 136, &c. ; and the total *incompatibility* of the several objects, to combine which is the problem proposed to a Governor of New South Wales, is touched on, though not so strongly as it might and should have been, in pp. 88-94. To govern in the best manner, with a view to the *convicts*, so as to make the penalty of transportation answer the end proposed (which is the most *important* point), and to govern in the best manner, with a view to the prosperity of the *colony* (which is the point a governor is naturally

the most likely to *aim* at), are two objects each, separately, difficult of attainment, but altogether inconsistent and opposed to each other.

‘There are some of your remarks in which I fully coincide, but which tend, I must confess, to strengthen my previous impressions. *E.g.*, I have no doubt that many (though I believe a smaller proportion than some suppose) are driven to commit crimes by distress; and that when this distress can be traced, as it often may, to injudicious legislation—to poor-laws, corn-laws, or the like—the nation is bound, not only to provide for the amendment of the bad laws, but for the relief of the distress resulting from them. But I would not have a man left to commit a crime to entitle him to this relief. It would be not only kinder and more just, but, I am convinced, *cheaper* also, to provide for the emigration of five or six poor men before they had been driven by distress to crime, than to transport one of them as a criminal. In the latter case you must take into account, besides his transport and outfit, all the loss and inconvenience to society from his depredation before detection, and from the depredations of the rest who finally escape detection, the trouble and expense of his capture and trial, and, lastly, the circumstance that he is probably altogether spoiled for an industrious settler.

‘I agree with you again in believing that some persons of tolerably decent character, but not proof against temptation where no risk is incurred, may be deterred by the dread of mixing with a herd of abandoned reprobates during the middle-passage. Doubtless those of them who do suffer this undergo great misery, so great that I should say it would be an allowable mercy to hang them instead—nay, to let them die on the rack. No physical death can be so bad as the moral death which is likely to ensue. In

proportion as the corruption of their moral character increases, their suffering from the contamination diminishes. The punishment is one which causes more *mischief* than it does pain, and which is the *more* severe to each in proportion as he is less of such a character as to be deserving of it—*i.e.*, incapable of restraint but from fear. Now these two are among the things most to be avoided in punishment. Still sundry persons may be in this way deterred, and this is a good as far as it goes, but the remedy seems to me far worse than the disease; for the proposed advantage rests on the supposition that the great majority of the convicts are profligates, to whom bad company is little or no penance, and who fester in their own corruption for four months, till by mutual contamination they shall have got rid of any remnants any of them may have of morality or decency.

‘When Shakespeare makes some one remark to Parolles, “If you could find a country where but women were who have undergone so much shame, you might *begin an impudent nation*,” he little thought, probably, that the experiment of beginning such a nation would be seriously tried, and from not having quite enough of shameless women we should be sending out cargoes of girls to supply the deficiency. I shall beg your acceptance of a sermon in which I have treated of the moral mischief resulting from setting up the law of the land as a standard.’

## CHAPTER VI.

1833.

Rev. J. Blanco White resides with the Archbishop, and is appointed tutor to the Archbishop's family—Letter to Mr. Badeley on the Clerical Society—Letter to Miss Crabtree—Letter to the Howard Society on the penalty of Death—Letter to the Anti-Slavery Society—Letter to Mr. Senior—Takes his seat in Parliament—Speeches on Irish Education and Irish Emancipation—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Church Temporalities Bill—Notes on same subject—Retirement of Dr. Hinds, and appointment of Dr. Dickenson as his successor—Associated with Archbishop Murray in Commission of Inquiry on Irish Poor—His independent conduct—Letter to Mr. Stanley on the establishment of a Divinity College—Letter to Mr. Hull on Church affairs—Letter to a friend on religious difficulties—Letter to a young clergyman—Fragment on the Sabbath question.

THE year 1833 opened on the same course of indefatigable labour as the former one had done. The Archbishop's home-circle had been increased within the last year by the arrival of the Rev. J. Blanco White, who came from Oxford to superintend the education of the sons of his friends, the Archbishop and Mr. Senior, under the roof of the former. Mr. Blanco White was a Spaniard by birth, an exile from his country on account of his abandonment of Romish principles. He first visited Oxford about 1817. An honorary degree was awarded him, for the services which he was considered to have rendered in the controversy with Rome; and he came to reside at Oriel in 1826, when his close intimacy with the Archbishop began. Each of the two was a hearty admirer of the other. Blanco White had been chiefly occupied with literary pursuits

while in England, his health not admitting of his officiating in the Church. It may be well here to observe, that the little work called ‘Second Travels of an Irish Gentleman,’ written as a kind of answer to Moore’s book with a similar title, was the production of his pen about this time, and was written with the sanction and under the superintendence of the Archbishop. This work, unpretending as it is, contains valuable matter for those interested in Protestant controversy, and deserves to be better known.

The following letter to Mr. Badeley was probably written in this year, and is worth inserting from its valuable suggestions on the formation of Clerical Societies :—

*To the Rev. J. Badeley.*

‘I have just time to suggest two most essential rules for your Clerical Society, without which it will be all that you fear, and worse—a theatre for the display of polemic oratory and spiritual mob-oppression.

‘1st. No one to *stand up* to speak.

‘2nd. No *decision* to be made of any disputed point; but each to state his opinions, and go home and retain them or change them as he likes best; but no *voting*, no resolutions, &c.

‘I speak from experience.’

*To Miss Crabtree.*

‘Dublin : January 7, 1833.

‘Your tale is very *much* improved, and I am now convinced you may turn out a very useful writer, since you can bear and profit by severe criticism. It has as yet been only seen by my children, who were much pleased with it. I am not yet able to say what else I shall do with both of them.

‘You are now able to swim without corks, and I dare

say would even write better on a plan of your own devising. Perhaps the sort of thing most wanted now for children and the poor, is some plain instructions in Political Economy. In the "Saturday Magazine"<sup>1</sup> you will see some attempts of mine which I am going on with. If you could work up some such instruction into familiar tales and dialogues, you might diffuse much useful knowledge. The above lessons I have tried on my own children of nine years, and find them quite intelligible; yet one who has learned them is in possession of much that many grown people, even in the higher classes, want. Miss Martineau is an admirable writer of tales on the subject, and leaves only one thing to be desired—viz., a correct view of the subject. She servilely follows McCulloch and Ricardo, and is right or wrong where they are. Her tale on the workhouse is very good—that on Ireland perhaps the worst: I mean in Political Economy, for as *tales* they are all good. Her principal errors are these:—

‘1st. Rent has not (as she represents) anything to do with *different qualities* of land. If all the land in the country were exactly equal, still if its quantity were *limited*, men would pay a rent for it, simply because they cannot get it without.

‘2nd. In her first tale she represents a man, in a back-settlement in Africa, which has communication with Cape Town, as finding *money* of no use; it would clearly be valuable, as it might be sent to Cape Town to buy goods for the settlement.

‘3rd. She is involved in confusion about “high and low,” as applied to *wages* and to *profit*; forgetting that wages

<sup>1</sup> Published first by the Christian Knowledge Society, and then, independently, by J. W. Parker, West Strand. It existed for several years after the date of this letter.

are reckoned at so much per *day*, and profits at so much per cent. \*Distinction between productive and unproductive labour is all fancy.\*<sup>1</sup>

‘4th. She supposes population to be continually gaining ground, or *likely* to gain ground, on subsistence; as if our wealth were not now much greater in proportion to our population (increased as that is) than in the time of the Heptarchy.

‘5th. She regards tithes as a payment, which they are not, in the same sense at least in which you pay a labourer. In a certain sense, *I* pay my tradesmen’s bills; and in another sense *my butler* pays them—*i.e.*, the money goes through his hands, but it *never was his*.

‘You will find these and several other points explained in the second edition of my Political Economy Lectures, just published with additions.

‘All Miss Martineau’s tales are very amusing, and may serve as models in point of form. From *you* I should expect a little more reference to religion. She is, I believe, Unitarian.

‘I fear I shall be called on to take a prominent part in the awful crisis of the Church which is approaching. Pray for my being supported in a task which calls for more than human wisdom and firmness.’

The next letter, addressed to the Howard Society, who

<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> { A footman produces *clean shoes* from dirty ones.  
A cook produces a *pudding* out of flour.

<sup>2</sup> { A shoemaker shoes out of leather.  
A baker loaves out of flour.

Surely all these are alike productive labourers; the distinction is only in the mode of *paying* them. No. 1 are paid by the *week* or *year*, No. 2 by the *hoes* or *loaf*.

had written to request his co-operation, needs no further explanation :—

*To the Secretary of the Howard Society for Removing the  
Penalty of Death.*

‘Feb. 15, 1833.

‘Sir,—I am most desirous to remove not only the penalty of death, but any penalty for which a sufficient substitute can be devised. Nor would I limit this to the case of offences where *personal violence* is absent. *No* offence should be visited by a more severe penalty than is necessary for its prevention. Nor does the absence or presence of personal violence seem to me sufficiently to draw the line between offences which it is the less or the more difficult and important to prevent. An incendiary, for instance, who should burn down fifty stacks of corn, or a burglar who should enter the houses of fifty industrious families in their absence, and strip them of their all, could not, in any point of view, be compared to advantage with one who should beat or even kill another in a quarrel.

‘The only effectual mode, as it seems to me, in which the Howard Society can promote their benevolent objects, is by setting themselves to devise such effectual secondary punishments as shall do away with the necessity of severe enactments. Any reasonable suggestion of this kind I shall be most ready to advocate; but *without this* all petitions against this or that mode of punishment will be utterly vain, as they will be met by the ready answer, “What is to be done?” and recommendations “to mercy,” in general terms, will only elicit the remark, that to leave crime unrepressed, is mercy to the *wicked* only, and cruelty to the *unoffending*. No legislative measure has as yet occurred to me for the “relief of the poor and

destitute of Dublin and its vicinity ;” but I shall gladly lend my support to any that may be devised which shall tend to increase, or at least not to diminish, the source from which, after all, must flow the greatest part of the comfort, the respectability, and the mitigation of calamity among the poor—viz., habits of steady *industry*, *frugality*, a spirit of *independence*, prudent *forethought*, and mutual *kindness* towards each other. Any measure which goes to destroy, repress, or prevent these, creates ten times more distress than it relieves. And such, as I know from experience, has been the effect of every legislative enactment that has hitherto been tried.’

A letter to the Anti-Slavery Society contains a further explanation of the views already put forth in 1831<sup>1</sup> :—

‘115 Sloane Street : Feb. 28, 1833.

‘Gentlemen,—I think myself bound to acknowledge the address which has been forwarded to me, as I have paid much attention to the question relating to West Indian affairs, and have happened to enjoy greater advantages towards acquiring a knowledge of them than most persons who have never visited the colonies.

‘I perfectly concur with you in thinking the existence of slavery in our empire a national sin, and that justice demands, therefore, that we should all be ready to bear our fair proportion of the evils consequent upon it.

‘Though this, however, is the case *really*, the persons most closely connected with the sinful act will often *appear* the chief or the sole perpetrators. One who has planned, for instance, and authorised a murder, will often fancy himself innocent, compared with him whose hands were actually imbrued with blood. And it is gratifying at

<sup>1</sup> See pp. 84-6.

once to our humanity and love of justice on the one hand, and to our selfishness on the other, to shift the blame and the punishment of a crime on to one's neighbour.

‘Thus the ancient Romans, when they did not like to observe a treaty, salved their conscience by delivering into the enemy's hands, to be dealt with at pleasure, the ambassador who had concluded it.

‘For this reason I would prefer urging the misery likely to be inflicted on the negroes themselves by a rash emancipation, rather than the loss unjustly inflicted on the planters, who are less likely to meet with sympathy.

‘Most of those who swell the cry for immediate emancipation are ignorant of the chief evil of slavery—viz., its making and keeping the slave unfit for freedom, by completely separating in his mind the two ideas habitually associated in the minds of free labourers, properly so called (not parish paupers), of labour and maintenance.

‘The greatest of ancient moralists lays it down, that a man is *naturally* a slave as long, and *only* as long, as he is unfit for freedom—*i.e.*, incapable of taking care of himself, and requiring to be guided like a child. Unhappily for the *application* of this excellent principle, the person who alone is well qualified both to *know* when a slave is fit for freedom, and to train him to that fitness, is the very person who is interested in keeping him a slave.

‘If any way can be devised which can make it the *master's* interest to free his slaves, that, it appears to me, and that alone, will solve the difficulty. And the only way I can conceive in which this can be effected is, to take off a portion of the duties on colonial produce, to be replaced by an equivalent tax on slaves; the tax to be *ad valorem*, the price of each slave to be fixed by the *master*, and each slave to be redeemable at the price

fixed. Thus the slaves best *qualified* to become independent labourers for wages, being the most costly, would be those the master would, for his own interest, be the most anxious to set free; and it is probable he would be ready himself to *lend* such a slave the price of his freedom, allowing him to *work out* the debt at a stipulated rate of wages. Such an intermediate state between slavery and freedom would, I think, prove the best preparatory to an independence advantageous to both parties.

‘Many inconveniences in detail must be encountered in this mode or any mode of getting rid of so enormous and inveterate an evil; but I never heard of, nor can imagine any other, which would not both bring much greater inconveniences, and also afford little hope of ultimate success.

‘Of course, in proportion as this plan succeeded, the revenue from the West India Islands would for the present diminish. This I would reckon as one of its advantages, as relief would thus be afforded to a class peculiarly in need of it. And if the English people grudged a trifling and temporary defalcation of revenue for the accomplishment of such an object as the gradual extinction of slavery, in the only way in which it can be effected without cruelty to the negroes themselves, it is plain their clamour in the cause of humanity must be the grossest hypocrisy. If objections should be raised to direct taxation without representation, I should, in agreement with Adam Smith, strenuously support so equitable a measure as the representation of the colonies, which might, I am convinced, be so arranged as to produce the greatest benefit to both parties.

‘If the idea which I have hinted at (which was suggested to me by an experienced and intelligent West Indian) should be thought worthy of further attention, I

shall be happy to communicate with any member of the committee on the subject.'

The following letter to Mr. Senior appears to have been written about this time. The question of Tithes was greatly occupying the public mind :—

‘ My dear Senior,—The worst of applying to Parliament for an explanatory clause is, that though probably *this*, or any other former Parliament would not hesitate, there is no saying what the new Parliament may think fit to do. Ministers are like the magician’s companion, who conjured a broomstick into a water-carrier, and then was half-drowned for want of knowing how to conjure him back again. As for the other suggestion, of charging additional reserved rent equivalent to the tithe-commission, it seems on the face of it fair and easy, but in practice is beset with difficulties. *E.g.*, my tenant-in-chief is A ; he occupies *part* of the land for which (under a new lease) he would be tithe-free after November 1833 ; part he has let to B under a “ toties quoties ” covenant (*i.e.*, engaging to renew to him as often as he renews with me) ; *this* land continues burdened with tithe-commission as before, because it comes under Clause XIV. ; part again he has let to C under a lease, without any covenant, of which, say, four or five years are unexpired. C is, during the continuance of the lease, burdened with tithe as before, but as soon as the lease expires, the tithe (as I apprehend) falls on *me*. Now, how am I to renew under these circumstances ? The obvious way would seem to be to agree for an increased reserved rent, the increase not to be paid except when and as far as the tithe becomes chargeable on the bishop ; but the tenants are in such alarm and uncertainty that I fear few of them will consent. The col-

lege, I understand, has adopted this plan ; but though such a corporation has much more hold on its tenants than a bishop, I understand only six out of sixty have consented to renew !

‘ It is curious that, having been poor all my life, I never knew what absolute *distress* was till I became Archbishop.

‘ Can you learn (what I have not yet been able to do) what the views of ministers are with regard to Church property, and whether they are likely to adopt my plan of corporations ?

‘ It is important that I should be enabled to try what I can do towards conciliating the other bishops, especially as I am in fact the only representative of the Church here in the next session, the others being infirm.

‘ I am not very likely to have time for writing the article on Proverbs, but if they could engage a good hand, I should be willing to give him a rough sketch of what I had designed to say.

‘ Do you see in the “Globe” an extract from a book to prove that transportation is an excellent punishment ? It is by a *Colonist*, and the presumption is that he is a rogue. I think they ought in fairness to insert as an antidote some extracts from my article. They have inserted none of that, only some of the letter to Earl Grey. I think we should confine ourselves to the testimony of *disinterested* and *respectable* witnesses.—Ever yours,

‘ R. WHATELY.’

In this year (1833) the Archbishop took his seat in Parliament for the first time. His friends in England naturally rejoiced to see his powerful mind brought to bear on English questions. But every year of his attendance in Parliament increased his conviction that little good could

be done unless that attendance were constant ; and that the periodical alternate sessions, though not sufficient for real usefulness in England, were quite enough to hinder his work in his own diocese ; and his steady and determined resolution to keep aloof from all party, could not conduce to popularity or to parliamentary influence. He usually avoided the ordinary work of the House, only speaking when the subject involved questions concerning Ireland or the United Church generally.

\*It was on March 19 in this year that he for the first time addressed the House of Lords, the subject being the Irish Education question. One part of his speech is memorable, as a manifesto of his own deliberate view of the part which he meant to take, and to which he adhered, with unswerving firmness, throughout his public life. ‘It was of little consequence,’ he said, ‘whether such a person as himself was attached to any party or not ; but if he was worth mentioning at all, he was worth mentioning with truth. He did not mean to impute wilful falsehood to those who made these accusations against him. Perhaps they judged from their own experiences ; perhaps they had never known, or seen, or heard of a person who was not attached to some party. All who knew him, knew that it had ever been a rule with him never to attach himself to any party, ecclesiastical or political. He was an independent man, and was entitled to be considered as an independent man.’

\*One other of his few speeches of this session is worth noting, on account of the light which is thrown on some of his peculiar views. It was on the project of Jewish emancipation (August 1, 1833). It is unnecessary to say that Whately, ever thoroughly consistent in his opposition to political disabilities on account of religious opinion, supported this measure unreservedly. But, in doing so,

he gave vent to his favourite opinions on the subject of the emancipation also of the Church itself, and of religion in general, from State control. Not only Jews, he thought, but Dissenters, should be restrained from legislating on Church questions. ‘Everything relating to the spiritual concerns of the Church should be entrusted to a commission, or to some body of men, members of that Church, having power to regulate those concerns in such a manner as may be most conducive to the interests of religion, and to the spiritual welfare of the people.’\*

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

‘October 16, 1833.

‘I am anxious that you and all others concerned should fully embrace and steadily keep in mind the distinction, in respect of my plans, between *civil* and *ecclesiastical* matters. That many cases arise that are of a mixed character, and also that the two have been *entirely* blended together for above a century, and *almost* entirely before, are circumstances which make it the more difficult, but not the less important, to keep them distinct in our minds.

‘Now to apply. In respect of any reform in the constitution of Church property, such as commutation of tithes, I fully agree with you in thinking it should originate with the laity, and be supported only by the bishops: whereas in respect of any ecclesiastical reform, such as (I will not say a *change* in the government of the Church, for it has none to change, but) the institution of a Church government for ecclesiastical matters—that, I think it most essential, should come from the bishops. Either our Articles, Bible translations, Catechism, Liturgy and other services, and our Discipline, need altering, or they do not: in either case, it is equally essential that there should be some person or body specially

appointed to legislate, and either to make the requisite alterations from time to time, or to pronounce authoritatively that none are needed. As it is, each man gives his own private opinion on these points, and there it remains as his private opinion : he might as well give his opinion on the affairs of the Turkish Empire. It is nobody's business. Parliament *will* not, and I think *should* not, legislate on these matters. And nobody else *can*.

‘ Now I do maintain that it would be most dangerous and disgraceful to let the first proposal for the remedy of this defect come from any but ecclesiastics. *This* should be moved by a bishop, and supported by the laity ; it is our proper province. Other cases are analogous. If there be a question from what funds the army or navy should be supported, the discussion of it should arise with those who are *not* in the army or navy ; but if the question be as to the stations of ships or forts, and the internal regulations of them, who so proper to bring *this* forward as experienced professional men ?

‘ Again, in respect to the Royal authority : I think, in respect of temporalities, the King (that is, “ by and with the advice of both Houses of Parliament ”) should have the entire control ; but in respect of matters purely ecclesiastical, I should prefer having the King a party to all decisions, by the same kind of arrangement by which he is considered present in a court of justice—*i.e.*, by *deputing* a suitable person to preside in his name. We all know that what is actually placed in the King's decision, is really left to be decided by the Ministry for the time being ; and I should be rather jealous of their having unlimited control in spirituals. As for cases, such as I have above alluded to, of a mixed nature (between secular and ecclesiastical) or of a doubtful character, the civil authorities should be

left to decide how far each case comes under their own proper province. Some people understand me to be more jealous of the encroachment of the State on the Church than of the Church on the State; but, according to my view, they, viz. each encroachment, *are both* one and the same. I can seldom get people to understand my meaning in this; because they *will* suppose that by the Church I mean the clergy, and by the State the laity. But I mean no such thing. I mean the two kingdoms, one of this world, and the other not of this world. I mean two societies, all the members of each of which may happen to be the very same, man for man, but which are not the less two societies, distinct in their respective objects, and distinct in their means of attaining them. It is plain, therefore, that whatever goes to blend the two together may be called with equal propriety an encroachment of either on the other.

‘I do not think this is at all hard to be understood, though there may be occasionally a nicety in applying it in some mixed cases. But the thing is, men’s heads have been long and thoroughly confused by the intermixture of secular and ecclesiastical matters ever since the time of Constantine; and the partial gleams of truth which have broken in from time to time since the Reformation, like streaks of partial daylight straggling into the midst of a room lighted with lamps, have only increased the confusion of thought. For the false principles *then* prevailing have never been abandoned; only, here and there, some true conclusion, at variance with them and insulated, has been admitted. It is like attempting to mend an incorrect map by inserting here and there patches from a correct one, which would not fit the other.

‘*E.g.*, all that one hears every day about a “national religion” is an instance of this confusion of thought. If

indeed anyone is speaking of the religion of a nation in reference to what prevails among the individuals of it, this is all very intelligible ; and in this case you may talk of national taste, national music, manners, literature, &c. &c. The nation, as a State or body-corporate, cannot have an ear for music. The State, however, *may* have, in a certain sense, a State religion ; and this meaning of “national religion” it is that leads to so much perplexity by being confounded with the other. A national religion in the sense of a State religion is very intelligible and very easily realised, but it is quite inconsistent with liberty of conscience.

‘A religion which is part of the *law of the land* may strictly and properly be called a national religion : it is an institution of the nation *as* a nation—pertaining to it not merely in respect of individuals considered as individuals (like national tastes or manners), or as members of some different society, but as members of the civil community. And such a religion our Reformers designed to maintain. But then they never dreamed of liberty of conscience, of not enforcing that which is part of the law of the land. But into this inconsistency their successors have fallen, by blending the two incompatible ideas of national religion and toleration. A departure from any of the institutions of the State is an offence against the State, and ought to be visited with secular penalties. *We* are like the physician who first prescribed ice, and then directed that it should be warmed. We reverence the Reformers so much that we allow them to put peas into our shoes, but take the liberty to boil them. Some seem confused between a State religion and an endowed Church ; but I think this would not have perplexed people, but for the other source of confusion. For analogous cases are very common. The endowments of a college, and of an alms-

house for widows, are protected by the State, and secured exclusively to persons qualified according to the prescribed conditions; yet no one calls celibacy in the one case, or marriage in the other, part of the law of the land.

‘As for what you say of gradual proceedings, the graduality (if I may coin the word) should differ I think as to the different points at issue. 1st. The alteration of anything that needs alteration in the ecclesiastical department, I would have so very gradual as never to come to an end at all. We should have a permanent legislature always at work to put in a tile here and a nail there, so as to imitate and meet the “imperceptible innovations insinuated by time.” 2nd. Then, again, as to the establishment of such a government, we should proceed with moderate and cautious steps, but without excessive delay. The point you mention (which is only one out of many), the providing for summary dismissal of scandalous clergymen, is one, for instance, which should not be deferred indefinitely. 3rd. But then, thirdly, as to the decision of the question whether the Church shall have a government or not, and the setting about to frame one, there seems to be, in this, no such thing as a gradual procedure. The decision may be delayed indeed, or may be brought on immediately; and what many persons mean by proceeding gradually, is merely deferring to take a step. But it is in no other sense, I think, that we can take this step gradually.

‘Do you know Lord Henley’s pamphlet—and the paper relative to his Reformation Society? I have taken the liberty to give him a few friendly suggestions.

‘In regard to Mr. Tooke’s book,<sup>1</sup> I agree with you that it is useless to discuss a question when the parties are not agreed on certain first-principles; but it may be

<sup>1</sup> Mr. T. Tooke’s work on ‘The Currency’ (published in 1826) is probably meant.

sometimes worth while to point out that there is a want of such agreement. For an author will sometimes be proceeding on an assumption which neither his readers nor himself are aware of. And it is very possible, I think, in this case that neither Mr. T. nor his readers are *conscious* of denying that money is a real tangible commodity. To point out, then, that an author is in fact proceeding on such a denial, amounts to a sufficient refutation.

‘As you are an amateur in etymological antiquities, can you tell me how the stone called asbestos came by that name? I have nothing for it but conjecture.’

The following notes, found among the Archbishop’s papers, relating to a publication of considerably later date, throws further light on the views and conduct of the Archbishop on the Church Temporalities Bill of this session (see p. 236):—

‘Mr. W. Palmer’s “Narrative of Events” connected with the “Tracts for the Times,” is a very curious and important document. The extracts from the “British Critic” compared with *predictions* put forth several years ago by several persons—among others in the “Pastoral Epistle of the Pope”—exceedingly curious. There was an outcry, at the time, against throwing out even a hint of the possibility of what has since come to pass. When he printed that address to King William IV., which was signed by most of the Irish prelates, and *not* by me (which circumstance he notices), he ought to have appended to it the paper I printed and circulated; stating objections to the address as it stood, and pointing out what alterations I conceived wanting. Several, who had previously signed the address, openly declared they would not have done so if they had first seen this paper. As it is, the public are left (not to say led) to infer, that as an address expressing attachment to the Church was not signed by

me, I did not feel as much of that attachment as the rest.

‘In justice to Lord Stanley, I never heard of any design of Government to suppress a greater number of sees. The Primate—to whom the plan was first communicated, and who assented to the general principle—wished that a *smaller* number should be suppressed, on the ground that, as he calculated, a sufficient revenue for church-repairs. &c. might be raised (it was all a question of computation) from a smaller number. The scantiness of the funds of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, as it is, must have long since convinced the Primate that his computation was erroneous. What I suggested as preferable, was a diminution of the revenues of the bishoprics, instead of the number, since *revenue* was the thing wanted, and *must* be raised somehow, unless the churches were to be left to fall to ruin. But he cut me short, by an assurance that none of the bishops would hear of such a thing. It is to be supposed that such is the opinion of Ministers now, since they have decided that it is better to merge Kildare into Dublin, than to keep up the see with a revenue of 800*l.* or 1,000*l.* per annum. I remember being struck at the time with the enthusiastic reception of the Primate at Oxford, by the very persons who were reviling those who had voted for the Church Temporalities Bill, the principle of which had received his sanction, before it had ever been communicated to those who voted for it (he was not then in Parliament). “One man may better steal a horse, than another look over a hedge.”’

In this year the Archbishop had the trial of losing the services of his valued friend and Domestic Chaplain, Dr. Hinds, who was compelled, from ill-health, to resign his office and return to England. His place was supplied

by one who now became the Archbishop's most efficient coadjutor, and his valued and trusted friend—the late Dr. Dickinson, afterwards (in 1840) Bishop of Meath. From this time to his death, in 1842, he was truly the right hand of the Archbishop; and among his letters and papers are frequent testimonies to the affection and confidence with which he regarded this friend.

The beginning of their acquaintance, the year after the Archbishop's arrival in Dublin, had been characteristic. Dr. Dickinson, who was then chaplain of the 'Female Orphan House,' an institution still existing, had been consulted as to a curtailment of the expenses of the establishment, and suggested a diminution of his own salary as chaplain. This was repeated to the Archbishop, who was struck with the trait; but it was somewhat later when he found the Chaplain examining his young pupils, and was so much pleased with his manner of drawing out their minds, as to enter into conversation with him and seek his further acquaintance.

His appointment as Domestic Chaplain soon followed, and his services were most valuable, his qualifications being precisely such as were most needed in such a capacity.

'His despatch of business,' writes the Archbishop, in a notice of his friend which he drew up after his death, 'was wonderful. He was never in a bustle: he would seem to a bystander to be "taking things easy," and, as it were, lounging through what he had to do; but few could do in two days as much business—some of it delicate and difficult business—as he could get through, and do admirably well, in one. . . .

. . . . 'Though generally liked as an amiable, and esteemed as a witty and intelligent man, he was remarkably destitute of *dazzling* qualities; and therefore

his highest excellences, intellectual as well as moral, were, in a great measure, lost (as far as admiration goes) on all except those who had something congenial thereto. He was not, nor I think ever would have been, a *brilliant* speaker ; but he had great persuasive powers, and practised that truest eloquence with great success, which is not perceived *to be* eloquence. Even inferior kinds of men, although they did not much admire him, were unconsciously much influenced by him. . . . .

. . . . . ‘ No one was ever less likely to be taken by surprise, or to be frightened ; and if ever an occasion did occur in which it was necessary to decide on the spur of the moment, no one ever had greater readiness in doing so, or had, as the phrase is, his wits more about him. Yet he never despised cautious deliberation, and re-deliberation, when he had an opportunity for it. He was not like those generals, who, when an opportunity offers for a sudden advantageous attack, or when a sudden march or other evolution is requisite for getting out of a difficulty, waste the time in deliberation which should be bestowed on action, and wait making preparations till the time is past, or are at a loss which way to turn on some sudden emergency. Nor, again, was he like one of those who, when left unmolested for any length of time, will not think of availing themselves of the advantage by improving their position, collecting reinforcements, &c. If you left him leisure, he always threw up field-works, and did all to make his position unassailable.

. . . . . ‘ He was in all points remarkably good in instruction, in conveying what he wished in a simple and clear way to the minds of others. And the union of his didactic power with such extraordinary quickness of apprehension as he possessed, constituted a very rare phenomenon. For, usually, those remarkably quick in

learning are ill-qualified for teachers, at least of those who are not equally quick; and those who are rather slow than not are usually the best teachers, because they are not tempted to hurry their learners over the ground, but are accustomed to view all the steps distinctly that are to be taken, and also all the difficulties in the path.

‘ Dickinson was, however, one of the few exceptions to this rule. . . . The sort of conversational eloquence he possessed was peculiarly suited to his situation under me, in which it was often in his power to say, with great advantage, what could not have been properly said by me. *E.g.*, the cases are numerous in which one is at a loss to decide whether such and such an attack, rumour, etc. should be repelled, or let alone; when, if unanswered, it may do considerable mischief, and if noticed by myself, it may thereby gain importance. In these cases his services were invaluable.’

In September of this year the Archbishop was associated with Dr. Murray, the Roman Catholic Archbishop, and eight lay-commissioners, in a Commission of Inquiry into the condition of the poor in Ireland, with a view to recommend measures for a system of relief. The Commission made its Report in 1836, but its principal recommendations were not adopted by the Government; which, on the contrary, introduced and carried, in 1838, a measure of exclusive workhouse relief, contrary to the opinion of the Commission.

The Archbishop laboured assiduously and anxiously, for about two years, to accomplish the objects for which the Poor Inquiry Commission was *ostensibly* appointed, and to prevent the ruinous measure (in his estimation) which the Ministry were bent on carrying. All these labours were vain. But the history of the whole transaction,

as he often observed, affords a useful lesson to those who, like himself, felt the evil of the law which was ultimately passed.

‘I remember,’ he said, ‘receiving a pretty broad hint, once or twice while the inquiry was going on, what Government expected us to report; and I replied at once, and I think also communicated straight to the Viceregal Court, that I, for one at least, should make no report but just what seemed to myself the best; for which of course none of those in power liked me at all the better; and ultimately they set aside the report of the commissioners chosen by themselves, and brought in a Bill quite in the teeth of our recommendations.

‘There was a very great desire,’ he continues, in some notes he took of those transactions, ‘among many persons in England, to assimilate the two countries, as far as regarded poor-laws; and in their most profound ignorance about Ireland, they supposed that because the reformed poor-law was a good thing for England, therefore just such a law would be a good thing for Ireland.

‘Now, first; the two countries were differently circumstanced in all the points most essential to the question; especially in this, that the want of employment was *real* in Ireland, and in England was merely a sham, because idle fellows threw themselves voluntarily out of work to get parish allowance. When I was at Halesworth, being one of the governors of the union—a pretty large one—I prevailed to have the allowance to the ablebodied “out of work” discontinued, and saved the union 1,600*l.* in a year; besides sending back to work a number of able hands, who readily found employment when they worked in good earnest; for which, of course, I was never forgiven by those I had so much benefited.

‘And, secondly, the reformed poor-law was “a good”

only inasmuch as it was a diminution of the enormous evil existing before; but to introduce it when that evil had *not* before existed, was to introduce a gratuitous mischief.

‘Lord ——, Sir P. Crampton told me, was at one time drinking two bottles of wine per day, “by the order,” as he said, “of his physician.” “Can this be so?” was asked. “Yes,” he said, “Dr. So-and-so had advised him to drink *half* his usual quantity; and so, as he had been drinking *four* bottles, he thereupon stinted himself to two!” And no bad plan either, if he had gone on at short intervals halving his dose till he had got down to two glasses; but it would not have been wise to have advised any one to take to drinking the two bottles.’

The establishment of a Divinity College was at this time an object the Archbishop had much at heart, to supply a want deeply felt by himself and others. The view was to furnish a more accurate and careful theological training than could be received at the University, where so many other objects necessarily occupied the time and attention of the students. The plan was well digested and carefully matured; and the Archbishop proposed to maintain the institution by devoting a portion of the income of the See to its support.

The letter which follows will more fully explain the aim and object of this plan:—

*To the Hon. Mr. Stanley, Secretary for Ireland.*

‘Dublin: Nov. 15, 1833.

‘My dear Sir,—The scheme I lately mentioned to you, of appropriating a portion of the revenues of the See to

the establishment of a Divinity College, for the instruction both of candidates for holy orders and for others, is one which I need not say I have much at heart : otherwise (considering how heavy and numerous are the calls on the Archiepiscopal income) I should have been unwilling, permanently, to deprive myself of a considerable part of my resources. But were my revenues fully adequate to carry into effect, without assistance, the whole of what I propose, I should still think it highly desirable, with a view to the benefit both of the Church and of the Government itself, that it should afford aid and countenance to any measure calculated for the Church's benefit.

‘Never was there a time when it was of more importance to both these parties that they should be, and should be perceived to be, on cordial terms with each other.

‘The desirableness of such an institution as I am proposing will, I believe, be admitted by all the most competent judges. Even in England, which has more than forty colleges, the most zealous and, at the same time, sober friends of the Church have, many of them, even proposed converting many of the cathedral establishments into clerical seminaries. They do not by this mean to throw any censure on the English Universities, any more than I do on the Irish ; but they feel, with me, that in these, though religious instruction is not neglected, that which is afforded is not so much calculated for the completion of a clerical education as for the preliminary part of it, and for the non-professional—religious instruction suitable to all educated men.

‘There is usually a space of two or three years intervening between the degree of B.A. and ordination—an interval too often wasted, or else employed in a less profitable way than with good guidance and instruction it might be. And many have afterwards to lament not

having devoted their interval to a well-regulated study of the Scriptures in the original languages, of Ecclesiastical History, and of the rules of Composition. When engaged in the laborious duties of a parish they are ill able to supply the defect.

‘I well know that there are, under the existing system, clergymen admirable for their attainments and mental cultivation ; but to such men themselves I would appeal, and I feel little doubt that most of them, if not all, would strongly concur in what I have said of the desirableness of improvement in the *general system* of clerical education.

‘The assistance which I most need for the execution of the plan, is the provision of a suitable building, which need be only sufficient to admit of three or four lecture-rooms for professors. The yearly expenses (of salaries, &c.) might be defrayed out of the revenues of myself and, I hope, other bishops ; and though I could not bind my successors (unless an Act of Parliament to that effect were framed), there would be, I trust, little fear of any future Archbishop withdrawing such a payment. But to buy or build a suitable house would require an outlay of capital which the See could not supply.

‘Were a building supplied by Government, and the institution commenced under favourable auspices, I have every reason to hope that some of the same liberality which was called forth by King’s College in London, would be displayed towards the much more moderate wants of such an institution as I propose.

‘To obviate all suspicion or thought of rivalry with Trinity College, I purpose to have as trustees and visitors the two Archbishops and the Provost of Trinity College ; and that the Divinity Professor for the time being should be (if he would accept the office) Principal, to superintend

the whole establishment ; which should contain Professors (one of whom might act as Vice-Principal), to give lectures (to candidates studying for Orders, and also to any others) in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, Ecclesiastical History, and Composition.

‘ Of the advantage to the Church of such an institution I need not enlarge. I am ready to abide by the decision of the best informed, most intelligent, and most candid of its members.

‘ That *I*, as a suggestor, a contributor, and a visitor, should obtain some increase of influence and of favour with the clergy; and that I consider this a desirable object, I am not at all backward to confess ; because I am conscious of wishing for influence with the clergy and with others, for no other end than the benefit of the people. But I wish to point out that the influence and favour with the Irish and also the English Protestants by Government, though the means of affording aid to such a plan, would be very great in proportion to the cost of it, and very seasonable at the present crisis. The calumny which has been assiduously circulated, of Ministers being hostile to the Protestant Church, and which has gained currency from causes which I need not advert to, could in no way be so fully confuted.

‘ And the ulterior advantage would be even more important still. For it cannot be doubted that a wise and enlightened and liberal administration will always find among its best friends a truly well-educated clergy ; and among its worst enemies a clergy ignorant, unenlightened, narrowminded, deficient in such knowledge and mental cultivation as befit their profession, and having their minds turned to more incongruous pursuits.

‘ Allow me to recommend most earnestly this matter to the attention of yourself and of his Excellency, and of

the other members of Government, and to invite your consultation of the best informed and most judicious both of the clergy and laity of the Establishment.—Believe me to be, dear sir, most faithfully yours,

‘ R. DUBLIN.’

The following letter was written in answer to one from the Reverend Mr. Hull, of Lancaster, on the subject of some alterations in church matters :—

*To the Reverend Mr. Hull of Lancaster.*

‘ 1833.

‘ Reverend Sir,—I sympathise very sincerely with your scruples ; but you must be sensible that neither I nor the Archbishop of Canterbury have any more power than yourself to afford relief, except in our capacity of Members of Parliament. It behoves you, therefore, to consider maturely and deliberate among yourselves, whether you would wish either of us to rise and move for a Bill to remedy the grievances in question ; or in what other way you would wish us to proceed.

‘ It is true, we must each of us act, ultimately, according to the dictates of his own judgment and conscience ; but these cannot be altogether independent of the views supposed to be entertained generally by the clergy. If, for instance, the Archbishop were, in compliance with your supposed desire, to procure an Act of Parliament directly and specifically for altering the Prayer-book, and if you should happen to be of opinion (as I am) that this is not the best mode of proceeding, you would reproach yourselves as having in part incurred the responsibility of a course you disapprove.

‘ I will briefly state what occurs to myself ; but I wish to know the general feelings of the clergy ; as I would

rather advocate the second-best course with their concurrence, than the best in opposition to them. It appears to me then, 1st. That every community ought to have a legislative (not merely an executive) government: 2nd. That the Church we belong to has none; the King, the bishops, the ecclesiastical courts, &c. having no power to alter laws, but only to administer them; and Parliament having never appeared to regard purely ecclesiastical matters as falling within its own proper province, as indeed our Reformers never had any such design: 3rd. That all alterations or regulations of ecclesiastical matters should be made by a regular legislative government of the Church for which they are designed: 4th. That the first step, therefore, in such a case as the present, ought to be, to apply, either to the King or to Parliament, for some government of the Church, or for some kind of commission to make inquiries and offer suggestions with a view to the constituting of a government; and this once established and in activity, there would be a body competent both to make regularly such alterations as might be deemed requisite, or (what is hardly less important) to pronounce authoritatively what alterations are *not* called for.

‘These are the points I would suggest for your consideration; and I would recommend your consulting the following pamphlets and books:—“Review of Writers on Church Reform;” also, the works referred to in the above—as many as are mentioned with approbation; and “Revised Liturgy,” by Rev. H. Cox, second or third edition.

‘In regard to myself as a representative, not of the Archdiocese or Province of Dublin alone, except in respect of any questions which concern that province exclusively, but, in common with the bishops, of the

*United Church* generally, I shall always feel myself bound to attend to, and consult with, my *constituents*. — I am, Rev. Sir, your faithful humble servant,

‘ R. DUBLIN.’

*Fragment of a Letter to a Friend on certain religious difficulties.*

‘ All I have time or space for is, some general remarks, which, if you develope them in your own mind, may lead to a satisfactory conclusion.

‘ First, read attentively, with an express view to your present subject, my fourth essay (being “ Secret Things ”) and the sermon which C—— has copied on “ Things Hard to be Understood,” and “ We see Through a Glass,” and King’s Discourse ; then consider and unfold the following maxims :—

‘ 1st. There are, properly speaking, *two* distinct doctrines, each called the doctrine of the Trinity, and thence often confused together : the one speculative, concerning the distinctions in the Divine essence ; the other practical, concerning the *manifestations* of God to man. They are as different as a certain opinion respecting the *sun*, from an opinion respecting the sunshine. A peasant has need to know the effects of sunshine in ripening corn, &c. &c. which he may do without forming any notion of the magnitude of distance of the sun, or of the theories of Ptolemy and Copernicus. The former is what I understand —— to have in view ; and I agree that, as it relates to a matter confessedly incomprehensible, it is better not to be dwelt on, lest we be bewildered and misled ; it is one of the “ secret things that belong unto the Lord our God.” The other is what *I* have had all along in view, and which I hold to be among the things that “ belong to us, that we may do,” &c. Unfortunately, by being confounded

with the other, it is in general swept away from people's thoughts, as a speculative mystery better kept in the background; whereas it is the corner-stone of the Christian faith (the doctrine into which we are baptized) and of Christian practice; since, if God stands in three relations to us, we are bound to act and feel suitably to the three relations in which we stand to Him.

'2nd. A very indistinct notion may suffice of such an article of faith as this last, even as a blind man *acts* every day on the imperfect knowledge he has of the power of sight possessed by others.

'3rd. *Apparent contradictions* are means employed in Scripture for conveying practically useful though indistinct notions of things not directly comprehensible. Hence, every statement will be in seeming opposition to some part of Scripture, if it be agreeable to the whole of Scripture. The seemingly contradictory statements in sermons are intended to modify and check each other. The hedge on the right side of the road is not the road itself; nor will it guard us against a precipice on the left side; the same may be said of the hedge on the left; we must pursue our course between them. You may find numberless applications of this. Hence, St. John is both the most instructive and *therefore* the most dangerous of the sacred writers.

'3rd. Beware of the common errors of attributing place and time to the Deity. We say, in conformity with our own powers of thought, that God is everywhere and always; but, in truth, a spirit is in no place at all, and an Eternal and Omniscient Being has no relation to time; His name is *I AM*: an Eternal Now does ever last.

'4th. Beware of classing texts together in reference to their *subjects* alone, without any regard to the *periods* at

which successive steps were made in the Christian revelation—jumbling confusedly Evangelists, Acts, Epistles. This, among other things, makes Socinians; who are right up to a certain point, but stop short in the middle of the gradual revelation; they have the blossom without the fruit. Jesus Christ was first made known as a man sent from God, whom God anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power; then, as the promised Christ; then, as He in whom “dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” in whom “God was manifest in the flesh,” in whom “God was reconciling the world unto Himself,” &c.

‘5th. Allow of no inference from Scripture on these points at least, unless the conclusion is, as well as the premisses appear to be, agreeable to Scripture. From St. John’s Gospel alone I could prove (if you let me choose my texts, and argue from them) Unitarianism, Tritheism, Arianism, &c. Take the whole in conjunction, and it proves what I may call the practical doctrine of the Trinity. As for the other, the speculative doctrine of the Trinity, I conceive the discussion as one of a totally different question; only, let it not overlay the other, so as to keep it in practice out of our minds.

‘The texts relating to the practical doctrine (which are perpetually taken hold of for the purpose of establishing the other) are at least much more abundant and prominent.

‘It may be that “God the Son is equal to God the Father,” but He is spoken of in Scripture either as inferior, or else as *one* with the Father: “He that hath seen Me hath seen the Father.” It may be that “God the Son was manifest in the flesh, and was in Christ;” but it is *said* simply, “God was manifest in the flesh”—“God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself.” It may be that “God the Son was united with human nature;” but

it is *said* that “in Him dwelleth all the fulness,” &c. It may be that Jesus Christ is called the Son, not in respect of His human nature, but of some mysterious filiation in the Divine nature, which makes God and the Son equal, and distinct. But it is *said* that He is “called the Son of God” on account of the miraculous conception, and that at the end of the world the Son shall be subject to the Father. It may be that it is a distinct Divine Person who dwells in the hearts of the faithful; but it is *said*, “We (I and my Father) will come unto him, and make our abode in him,” &c., &c.’

*Extract from a letter to a young Clergyman.*

‘Do not begin by devoting your chief attention to those who seem to want reformation most; select the best informed and best disposed—improve *these*, and use them as your instruments in reforming their neighbours. If you had a promiscuous pile of wood to kindle, where would you apply your light, to the green sticks, or to the dry?’

‘I understand the disease which you call self-righteousness; though the word is hardly yet good English, and is of anomalous formation, and rather belongs to the province of Cant, than to the one in which you are. It is very hard to cure, since most of the sins you would press on their notice they either do not own, or do not admit to be sins. This, I think, is the best course: ask a man whether he feels more desire for heavenly happiness than for this world’s goods—more gratitude to Christ than to any earthly friend; whether he estimates more highly *His* goodness who did and suffered all for the benefit (exclusively) of others, or his *own*, who by his good conduct is benefiting himself; whether he would not think himself sufficiently repaid for his virtuous exertions by two or three hundred years of happiness; whether he is

duly grateful for having an eternity of happiness offered ; whether he is grateful for the spiritual aid from which *all* good conduct must proceed.

‘Beware of offending him too suddenly, denying the goodness of his conduct ; bring him to feel and act as a Christian in any one point, and the rest will perhaps follow. In some dispositions self-abasement must be the *last* effect produced ; in others it is the first.

‘The same doctrines must be taught to all, but not in the same order ; you must cleave the log according to its grain. Let not your sermons be avowedly hortatory, nor begin with exhortation ; let your apparent object be explanation. Ignorance is not the greatest, but it is the first evil to be removed ; it is also the one most in your power to remove, and it is one which people will not be in the outset so much disgusted to be told of. And do not think anything irrelevant, however remote it may seem from Christian practice, that tends to interest them in Scripture studies and religious topics.

‘I think there would have been no difficulty as to Paul’s meaning in Rom. vii. if people had always read a portion of Scripture continuously (without chapter and verse), instead of taking detached passages interwoven with the context of some human treatise. This, which I call making an anagram of Scripture, often leaves a man well acquainted with every part of the Bible ; but no more notion of the *whole* of any of the books, than he would have of a tree from seeing a house built of its timber.

‘The sentences in question, taken by themselves, may certainly bear either sense—viz., as spoken literally of the individual Paul at that moment, or, by a figure of speech very common in all languages, as spoken indefinitely of “a man generally” in some supposed situation.

‘The context in each case generally makes it clear, to a reader of common sense, which is meant. In this very letter, *e.g.*, I have used this very form of speech, and I dare say you have had no doubt of my meaning. Now if you look to the context (especially in the original, though the translation is pretty clear) of the whole passage, including the beginning of the next chapter (and remembering that Paul did not make chapters), you will see that he is contrasting the condition of a man under the Law, which gave the knowledge of right and wrong, and of one under the dispensation of the Spirit, which supplies the power to do right and avoid wrong : the one brings mere remorse, the other reformation ; the one shows a man his “condemnation,” the other the means of escape from it.

‘Now take the literal sense, and the whole becomes as absurd and self-contradictory as the Romanist’s interpretation of “This is my body.” “Wretched man, who shall deliver me from the body of this death ? I *thank* God,” &c. What does he thank God for ? For leaving him *undelivered*—wretched—condemned to death ? Just the reverse. “For the law of the Spirit of life in Jesus Christ hath made me free from the law of sin and death : for what the law could not do,” &c., &c. “That the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For they that are after the flesh do mind the things of the flesh, but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.”

‘As for the inward disapprobation of sin and admiration of goodness, &c., which Paul describes, it is exactly what he meant it to be—a description of an unrenewed sinner ; for how could a man be a sinner at all if he had no notion, either from reason or revelation, of the superiority of virtue over vice ? You might as well call a brute sinful. “Video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor,” are the words

of a heathen, not certainly intending to describe a renewed Christian.

‘It is not, however, in all cases equally important to fix the true meaning of a passage ; but in the present instance the misinterpretation is ruinous in practice. Should you preach all your life the soundest doctrine, and the purest morality in all other points, yet insist on this one error, your hearers, when they came to the personal application, would consider themselves safe if they were but as good as Paul, whom it would be presumptuous to think of excelling ; they would feel secure therefore in substituting the admiration of goodness for the practice, and in living habitually in the neglect of any known duties, and the practice of any known sins, so they did but *acknowledge* their sinfulness. You would be building a strong hedge, and then breaking a gap in it.’

The following fragment, on a different subject, will interest some :—

‘I asked Dr. Wolff, the missionary, his opinion (without any suggestion or hint of my own) as to the Apostolic decree in Acts,<sup>1</sup> viz. : 1st, What is the meaning of *πορνεία* in that place? and 2nd, Why it contains no allusion to the observance of the Sabbath? His answer appeared to me sufficiently interesting to induce me to beg him to write it down :—

‘“The translator of the Armenian Bible, Mesrop, and of the modern Chaldean in Koordistan, and the Syrian Church around Mosul, as also some of the German Biblical scholars, translate *πορνεία* “swine’s flesh ;” and I really believe that this is the sense.

‘“With regard to the Sabbath, there is evidently no mention made to the Gentiles, for they were not

<sup>1</sup> Acts xv. 20, 29 & xxi. 25.

commanded to keep it. But the Lord's-day was celebrated among the early Christians.

‘“That the Sabbath and the Lord's-day are not the same, or, rather, that the Lord's-day was not substituted for the Sabbath-day, is clear from 1 Cor. xvi. 2, which is a custom among the Jews till now—viz., to make the collection for the wants of the Synagogue on the first day of the week; for on the Sabbath they are not allowed to touch money.”’

## CHAPTER VII.

1834—1835.

Letter to Mr. Senior on a 'Statistical Dictionary'—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Divinity College—Letters to Rev. J. E. Tyler and Dr. Blomfield illustrative of his magnanimity—Letter to Earl Grey on University Reform—Letter to Dr. Hawkins on Church matters—His tender regard for the feelings of men—Letters to and from Dr. Newman respecting their differences of opinion on Church matters—Paper on Church Temporalities Bill—Letters to Mr. Senior on Church affairs, &c.—Mr. Blanco White, embracing Socinian views, retires from the Archbishop's family—Grief on this account manifested by the Archbishop, who subsequently pensions Mr. White.

THE first letter in 1834 is on the subject of a proposed Statistical Dictionary :—

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

'January 11, 1834.

'Look at the Book of Ecclesiasticus in the Apocrypha, chap. xxxviii. ver. 32, and you will see very old authority for *the law of settlements*. Verses 24, 25, and 33 would apply to a statesman you know of.

'Could not one of the most popular modes of introducing knowledge on the subject be a "statistical dictionary," professing to give, not of course a knowledge of all facts, even in any one country, but the sense or senses of each term used, the principles of calculation in reference to it, and a few statements by way of specimen? *E.g.*—

'*Wages*—Senses in which used, by this and that writer; three or four statements of rates of wages, in money or

commodities ; in England, now, and in other parts ; and ditto, in four or five other remarkable periods.

‘ *Population*—Per square mile, in five or six places ; rate of increase in five or six periods and countries. See *Marriage* and *Mortality*.

‘ *Duties*—Prohibitory ; financial ; centralising ; four or five specimens of each, now ; ditto, in other times.

‘ *Raw Produce*—Specimens of countries ; importing and exporting principally ; what kinds.

‘ *Taxes*—What ; species of ; effects of ; amount in Great Britain, &c., &c.

‘ I think forty or fifty terms of this kind, thus explained, and, though called a dictionary, forming rather a *grammar* teaching *the parts of speech* of the science, and the declensions and conjugations, might be comprised in a small volume, with which any one might bind up at the end some blank leaves, in which to insert particulars relative to the head he was chiefly interested about.

‘ If the plan of such a work were sketched out, several hands might be employed on the several articles. It should express no *opinions* on doubtful points, except doubtfully.

‘ Ever yours,

‘ R. W.’

The ‘voluntary system,’ that is to say, a system in which the clergyman’s salary depended on the inclination of his congregation, and was not regulated by any fixed standard, was one to which the Archbishop always strongly objected, on the ground that it placed a pastor too much in the power of his congregation. His views on the subject appear in the following letter to the Bishop of Llandaff, written early in this year.

In this letter he also again refers to his cherished project of a Divinity College, in which Marquis

Wellesley (who had succeeded the Marquis of Anglesey, as Lord-Lieutenant, on Sept. 26, 1833) warmly seconded him :—

*To Bishop Copleston.*

‘February 9, 1834.

‘In reference to endowments, I wish some one would point out—it would not do for *us*—the wretched thralldom of those ministers who subsist on the voluntary contributions of their congregations. I have seen more of it lately. The free-trade principle here applied leads to such freedom as that of the Turks, who are exempted from the burdensome restraint of a complete system of laws, to be subjected to the caprice of a Cadi. A preacher is forced to keep feeling the pulse of his hearers, and pandering to their prejudices.

‘I think much may be said for many cases of *pluralities* also. They are often great abuses, but so is the appointment of any negligent minister. I have often seen advantage in placing three or four churches under one able and experienced man, who has curates under him in each, who are serving a kind of apprenticeship with him, and the best of whom may be expected hereafter to be raised to a situation like his.

‘And the disproportionate value of situations in a Church (though it may be either excessive, or ill-regulated) is, I am convinced, economical. The average value of Scotch livings is computed to exceed those of England and Wales. Why then is the ministry hardly considered as a gentleman’s profession in Scotland? Because the respectability of each profession is determined by the condition of those in its *highest* stations. What drudgery, and for how small a reward, is undergone by barristers, officers in the army and navy, &c.! The situations of judges, &c., and of generals and admirals, keep up the professions,

partly by holding out hopes to the sanguine, but much more by conferring a respectable character.

‘I wish that all who discuss the questions about the “Union of Church and State,” would premise distinctly what they mean by the phrase; for I have often heard four or five men debating pro and con with much eagerness, and all understanding as many different things by it; so that their agreements and their disagreements are often only apparent—

‘1st. That every subject of the State should be necessarily a member of the Established Church.

‘2nd. That all holding any civil office should be so.

‘3rd. That certain functionaries of the Established Church should, as such, sit in the House of Lords.

‘4th. That the endowments of the Church should be recognised and protected.

‘Each of these, besides other modifications of each, I have found on different occasions to be meant, in the language both of advocates and opponents, by the union of Church and State. Lord Wellesley—a great academical founder—and myself have been contriving the institution of a Divinity College, as an extension of an endowed library (Marsh’s), originally a part of the old Archbishop’s Palace; the rest of which, now the property of Government, he proposes to give up for lecture-rooms, &c. The object is to occupy the interval, now so often wasted, between graduating and becoming candidate for Orders—often two or three years—in acquiring that additional knowledge of the Scriptures and of Ecclesiastical History, together with skill in imparting that knowledge, which I have so often found lamentably wanting.

‘I propose to endow it with part of my own revenue, and I have reason to hope some of the bishops will

follow the example. To connect it with Trinity College, it is proposed to make Elrington (the son of the Bishop of Ferns, and divinity-professor at Trinity College) the first professor. He is an excellent man, and enters warmly into my views.'

In a letter written at this time, to Mr. Senior, he refers to a German translation, recently made, of his 'Essays on the Peculiarities of the Christian Religion,' and 'On Romish Errors.' 'Don't you think,' he says, 'that I might send copies of my German works to the Duchess of Kent? If so, pray tell Fellowes to put up duplicates of each in decent binding, and send them with my respects. The only error in the translation that I know of, is in the title of the "Peculiarities," which should have been rendered, I understand, "Eigenthümlichkeiten," literally, "own-domlike-hoods." The first volume contains, what no English one does, a life of me.'

The following extract from a letter to a friend, the Rev. J. E. Tyler, who had been fellow and tutor of Oriel, shows the spirit in which the Archbishop met the storm of obloquy to which he was still continually exposed:—

'March 1834.

'I wish my friends not to be uneasy, or to suppose that I shall be so, at any of the idle stories that are circulated about me. And, in particular, I would have them guard against the very natural mistake of supposing this or that transaction, real or fabricated, to be the real *cause* of any clamour of which it may be made the *occasion*. It would be no greater mistake for a man afflicted with the gout, for instance, in one foot, to imagine that if that foot had been amputated, he should be free from the

disease ; which, in that case, would have seized the other foot, or the hand, or the stomach. Party-scribblers *will* say something for the entertainment of those who are ready to listen to anything. If one story is contradicted, they *will* immediately invent another ; like the wolf, who, when the lamb pointed out that the stream could not flow upwards, immediately began to charge her with an offence committed before she was born. It is quite fruitless to keep oneself in a state of feverish anxiety to guard against or repel all calumnies from all quarters ; and I am convinced it is not only easier, but more effectual also, for a really honest man to go on in a straightforward honest course, and trust fearlessly to time to bring truth to light.

‘I can say this now, in a great degree, from experience. For hardly any one, I believe, ever entered on an office with a greater or more violent mass of prejudice to encounter ; and I never knew a case of any one having in the same space of time surmounted more, except, perhaps, those who will stoop to hypocrisy and dissimulation of principle.

‘The number of those by whom I am, *bonâ-fide*, misunderstood, either here or in England, is not very great, and is less every day. There is, indeed, and probably will ever be, a considerable number who, for various reasons, choose to misunderstand or, rather, misrepresent me. But to take any trouble about them would do neither of us any good. If not noticed, the greater part of them will in time cry themselves to sleep. But I wish my friends to reflect, more than perhaps some of them do, how many and various causes are at work to prejudice different descriptions of persons against me ; and also, that as most of these causes are such as the persons themselves would never acknowledge, even to themselves, and are probably even unconscious of, hence it would be lost

labour to meet the objections which they do allege, but which, in fact, are but a pretext. It is but lopping the branches, while the root is concealed underground and untouched. Truth and justice have in themselves enemies enough, but these rarely confess, or even know, themselves to be such. “Marvel not,” says Our Lord, “if the world hate you”—“because ye are not of the world, therefore the world hateth you.” And till that which is in name the Christian world shall have become much more so in spirit than it has ever been yet, this description will still apply to a large portion of it. But those who are in sincerity labouring in the cause of Christ will not be hated *avowedly* for *that* reason. Satan knows better how to “transform himself into an angel of light.”

‘All circumstances considered, the degree of success with which I have sustained and partly mitigated the tide of obloquy has been far beyond what I could possibly have anticipated. And, indeed, I believe I owe not a little to the very excess of violence with which I have been assailed. The proverb says, “Slander stoutly and something will stick;” but I believe it is possible for a slanderer to overdo his work—to excite incredulity by boundless extravagance of calumnies, and to disgust by too open a display of injustice and malignity. And the more bitter and assiduous the attacks made on any one who does but take care that they shall be undeserved, the more will they produce one benefit to him, which ought not to be overlooked. All the watchfulness sharpened by malice—all the ingenuity, the perseverance, and the unscrupulous audacity, which have been put in requisition against me, from several different quarters, by men of almost every party, for a good while past, and most especially since I came hither, have failed in bringing any charge against me that was not either founded in

falsehood or in gross misrepresentation, or else rather creditable in the eyes of good judges than the contrary. Now, that my character is really unimpeachable, my friends have long since done me the honour to believe ; but it was my enemies alone that could completely prove it.

‘It is a trial indeed to human nature, to meet with so much injustice and ingratitude from those we are seeking to benefit, as every one must expect if he imitates our Heavenly Father, “who is kind to the unthankful and to the evil.” But the usefulness of such a discipline may easily be perceived. If we generally obtained the praise of men for our good actions, we could not even ourselves be sure that it was not that praise we were aiming at. And though one who aims in singleness of heart, not at obtaining, but at deserving, men’s approbation, will in the end, oftener than not, obtain it (if he chance to live long enough), it must be his own fault if he then prizes it too highly ; he will have learned from the earlier part of his experience what bad judges of mind men usually are, and he will have been trained to refer to an unerring Judge. He will have been hardened against the intoxication of popularity when it does come, by having seen how unjustly it is often bestowed and denied. The favour of men is to be sought as a means, though not as an end, as far as we can conciliate them without turning out of our own straight course. But to swim with the stream, for fear of incurring odium, is to sacrifice the end to the means. I would be content on many occasions to do a little good, rather than by aiming at too much to fail of all. But we must carefully watch ourselves while proceeding on this plan, and remember that we may, for the sake of preserving unanimity, or the appearance of it, in the Church, for instance, fall into the error of the

Romanists, whose corruptions accumulated through their dread of a breach of unity. To oppose nothing that a considerable number of churchmen advocate, because opposition will lead to division, and division is to be shunned, is in fact, we should remember, to deliver up every community to the uncontrolled guidance of the most forward; not necessarily of the wisest and best, or even of the majority, but of those who on each occasion happen to have the start, and who are the most violent and pertinacious in insisting on having everything their own way; for the more unreasonable and domineering they are, the more danger there is of discord resulting from any opposition offered them.

‘There may be occasions, indeed, to be judged of by each man’s own discretion, when it is better to sit still under some minor evils, than to risk greater in the attempt to remedy them. But I would not, even when I did act on that principle, choose that occasion for referring to the precept, “In your patience possess ye your souls,” because I think it dangerous and hardly reverent to apply any passage of Scripture to a purpose foreign from the context. If what we mean to recommend is taught in *other* passages of Scripture, *those* ought to be the ones adduced; if again, without being expressly taught, it is agreeable to Scripture and to reason, let it rest on those grounds. But a misapplication of a Scripture text, though it may be harmless in some particular instance, affords countenance to a most pernicious practice.

‘If you look to the context of that passage, you will see that, however proper neutrality and acquiescence may be on some occasions, Our Lord was referring to an occasion of exactly the opposite kind. He was exhorting His disciples to patient perseverance, under the obloquy and opposition they would have to encounter in labouring

to effect the greatest *innovation* that ever was brought about in the world ; patience in stemming the tide of popular prejudice, and in bearing the reproaches of those most nearly connected with them, for their persevering effort to overturn what those held most sacred ; patience in enduring, among other things, to be stigmatised as “pestilent fellows” and “movers of sedition,” as being the occasions of that “division” and family disunion and enmity which their Master foresaw and prophesied.

‘Whatever the occasion may in fact be, on which it is most advisable to let things take their course, the present crisis of the Church is clearly not one of those. There is a general stir in men’s minds in relation to Church matters, both within and without the pale of it ; such that those who think it both possible and desirable that everything should remain just in the state in which it has been for the last century, are just as much required to come forward and advocate that continuance as the proposers of any change are to advocate such change. However reluctant we may be to take any decided step, we should remember that in such times as these to sit still (like some who in the Great Rebellion “waited for the Lord”) is, in fact, to take one of the most decided steps of all ; it is to put ourselves at the absolute disposal of those who are resolved *not* to sit still.’

*To the Bishop of London (Dr. Blomfield.)*

‘Dublin : March 30, 1834.

‘My dear Lord,—Independent of the deference due to your lordship’s judgment, and to your opportunities of ascertaining the state of the public mind in England, I should be disposed, even from reflection on the circumstances of the case alone, to decide on the expediency

of deferring all steps relative to the internal regulation of the Church, till the questions pertaining to the temporalities shall have been disposed of.

‘There is likely to be much excitement, alarm, and angry feeling occasioned by *each*, and it is better if possible to avoid encountering the two difficulties in combination. It is also important to avoid, as far as possible, mixing up secular with ecclesiastical questions, or leading any to impute, either through confusion of thought, or from malicious design, to such as do not discern the imputation, schemes for restoring to the clergy the right of self-taxation, or for encroaching in some way on the civil power. Though I have no hope that these difficulties can be entirely avoided, there is a chance that they may be somewhat mitigated, by waiting till the agitation connected with tithe-commutations shall have somewhat subsided.

‘Some impatient spirits, I doubt not, there will be, who will deprecate any procrastination, apprehending that fresh-and-fresh excuses for sitting still will always be forthcoming from time to time. And they are so far justified in that apprehension that there always, no doubt, will be, as there always have been, persons who, whenever the public mind is in a state of agitation, say, “Do not stir, but wait for quieter times.” And when the agitation subsides, say, “You had better let well alone; do not disturb those who are satisfied.” When the bed of the torrent is dry, in short, they urge that a bridge is not wanted; and when the stream comes down, that it cannot be built. But to the wise “there is a time for all things,” and though we must not hope to satisfy either those who never find a time to act, or those who never acknowledge a time to pause, it may be possible to satisfy the most reasonable in any class, by suspending

proceedings, not indefinitely, but till another question which (whether rightly or wrongly) has actually the precedence shall have been disposed of. In the meantime, I am glad that some of the leading men among my clergy have so taken up the matter as to show that they at least are not desirous (and would rather discourage any who may be so) of setting at nought the judgment and feelings of their English brethren, or of withholding all deference from the bishops.

‘There is a medium—and I think there are many among the most influential of the Irish clergy who perceive and aim at that medium—between allowing, on the one hand, an absolute *veto*, in respect of questions vitally important to the whole Church, to any individual, however entitled by station and character, to precedence; and on the other hand, not even asking the *advice* and co-operation of any one who holds such precedence. It is time enough to take steps independent of, or in opposition to, the Archbishop of Canterbury, or any one else holding a high station in the Church, when he shall first have been consulted, our reasons listened to and replied to, and our co-operation sought in vain.’

The following extract from a letter to Earl Grey shows the Archbishop’s views on the subject of University Reform, in immediate reference to a ‘Bill to remove certain Disabilities which prevent some classes of His Majesty’s subjects (Dissenters) from resorting to the Universities,’ introduced in April this year. His new and pressing avocations had not in any degree cooled his attachment to Oxford; and through life his interest in the welfare of the University was deep and strong:—

‘July 1834.

‘My dear Lord,—When I was last in town, I had some little conversation with your lordship relative to the

proposed changes in our Universities; but I did not pursue the subject, as I understood no steps were likely to be taken this year.

‘ Since, however, the question has come on, I will take the liberty of making a few inquiries and suggestions relative to it, which I trust will not be thought presumption, considering that I was actively engaged in various departments of the business of the University of Oxford for above a quarter of a century.

‘ By the reports of the debates, I should be led to suppose (but I suppose this is an error of the reporter) that there is a design of *compelling* heads of houses to admit Dissenters.

‘ This would be giving the latter a most unfair advantage, for there never has been yet at least any *obligation* on a head of a house to admit any member of the Established Church.

‘ It has always been left to the arbitrary decision of the governor of each college to admit or refuse (as a commoner) any one who offers; and I am convinced that to take away this arbitrary power—though, like all power, it may be liable to abuse in some particular instance—would be total ruin to the University.

‘ I, for one, would sooner have been governor of a parish workhouse than Principal of Alban Hall, had I been obliged to admit on *demand* any one who presented himself, unless I could establish some legal disqualification against him.

‘ But then, it may be said, if the heads of houses are merely released from a restriction, and *permitted* to receive Dissenters, this will afford no relief to the complaining parties if the heads should form a combination to refuse them. Now the obvious remedy for this, and which would also be in other respects a great benefit to

the Universities and to the public, would be to *restore* the *Universities* to their original condition, by doing away the *monopoly* gradually acquired by the now-existing colleges and halls. A *master* mason, shoemaker, &c., &c., has a right as such to take *apprentices*.

‘And that a *master of arts* had originally a corresponding right, is plain, not only from analogy, and from historical documents, but from the very formula in which the degree is conferred. He is expressly admitted as a *teacher*.

‘Every M.A. therefore was originally, and should be now, entitled to demand of the University authorities (unless good cause could be shown against him) a licence to open a hall on his own account; of which there were formerly at Oxford, and I believe at Cambridge, a very great number. It was partly under the reign of Elizabeth, and partly under that of Charles I., that the monopoly was introduced, under which the *colleges* have, in fact, swallowed up the University.

‘I cannot but think that some weight is due to my judgment in recommending the restoration of the Universities to that, their original state, from the circumstance that when I myself was one of the monopolists, as head of a hall, I always was an advocate for the indefinite multiplication of halls, which would in fact have been rivals to my own. I have always approved of a wholesome and friendly competition under due regulations.

‘This measure (which, like most reforms, is, in fact, not an innovation, but a restitution) would ensure the admission of Dissenters at one hall if not at another.

‘At Oxford there would be this objection: that as the University is now constituted, the hebdomadal board, which digests all business preparatory to its

being submitted to convocation, consists of all the heads of houses.

‘At Cambridge what answers to this board being the Caput, an elective body, there would be no objection connected with that to the increase in the number of halls.

‘And I myself think the government of Oxford would be improved by adopting that portion of the Cambridge system.

‘I always did think so, even when I was a member of the Oxford Board; so that in this, as in every other point connected with the present question, I am speaking in opposition to any personal prejudices I can be supposed to have. And throughout I will venture to say that the tone which has been assumed by some of those most strenuously opposed to my views, is what might have been assumed by *me* with at least as good ground.

‘Ask the heads of houses, how many of them give lectures themselves in the Thirty-nine Articles, to *all* their men; whether they take care that *every one* of their men has from three to six divinity lectures *every* week; whether *every* member is examined (before the head) in Divinity at the end of each term, for at least the last five or six terms before his becoming a candidate for the degree of B.A.; and I think your lordship will not find many who can answer these questions in the affirmative as I could.

‘I might even point out colleges from which men have been permitted to offer themselves at the public examinations for degrees, without having ever had any one college-lecture in divinity, from first to last!

‘My plan was to trust more to *instruction*, and less to *subscription*.

‘The *mode* of a man’s declaring himself a member of

the Established Church, by subscribing to the Articles, I always thought highly objectionable. It may be done with a safe conscience when the meaning is duly explained. But the best way in all cases is to say in plain English exactly what you do mean. There is always danger in teaching men to form habits of explaining away words. It has always appeared to me a breach of the Third Commandment to trifle with the language of solemn obligation.'

*To the Rev. Dr. Hawkins.*

'Dublin: 1834.

. . . . .

'When I wrote in the carelessness of haste, of the "principle" of the Church and State being in a Christian nation coextensive and one society, this, as you observe, is not a "principle," but a "fact," which does or does not exist in each nation; and neither I nor Arnold could be ignorant that such is *not* the actual state of the fact in those numerous nations which recognise either several religions, or none. It is hardly necessary, I suppose, to say that the principle I meant is the propriety and duty of thus amalgamating the two. That it is not in fact done is indeed the very complaint Arnold makes. But in maintaining that a Christian nation ought to be a Christian church, I think all our reformers, and most of our divines, agree, including Archbishop Magee in his last charge, an extract from which I have cited in a note in my chapter on "Persecution."

'The chief difference, as it seems to me, between Arnold and the rest is, that our older divines and politicians were for driving the flock by force into the fold, and he for building the fold round the whole of the scattered flock. They thought much of strict adherence

to sound doctrine in the Church, and cared little about liberty of conscience or liberty of any kind; he, *vice versâ*.

‘The problem is to reconcile the two, a problem which on the principle they both set out with I do not see how to solve. But I think what he says about “self-government” is rather too hardly construed. If the State and the Church are to form one society, there must surely be as much admixture of republican elements in the one as in the other. In an absolute monarchy the people have nothing to do with the laws but to obey them, and if then the Church and State are combined, there is no self-government in either. But in Great Britain and the United States, where the chief civil power resides in an assembly of representatives, then, if the Church and State are one, there must be exactly the same degree of self-government in ecclesiastical as in civil matters.

‘The present state of things in this country is this: the right to legislate in ecclesiastical matters is lodged, *de facto*, in Parliament, of which one house has long since had its members elected by persons of various persuasions, and they are now left to choose men of their own persuasions as their representatives. A considerable portion therefore of the legislators for the Church are not members of the Church. 1. Ought this state of things to continue? 2. Or shall it be remedied by so enlarging the pale of the Church as to admit all? 3. Or by separating the ecclesiastical government from the civil? Let each say which of these alterations he adopts before he censures the other two, unless he can suggest — which I cannot — some fourth.

‘I do not myself coincide with Arnold, but I think justice is hardly done him by those who anathematize him without acknowledging, or, I should think, perceiving,

the strong need, and the difficulty of grappling with the question which he has (I think unsuccessfully) undertaken to answer. But he is at present, I suppose, the giant or dragon on which the University knights who covet distinction sally forth to break a lance.'

The following letter (to one of his chaplains) is characteristic of the Archbishop's anxiety to pay due regard to men's feelings. He was aware that all who were in any way connected with himself were liable to share in the attacks to which he was continually liable, and he was anxious that none should remain in such connection without counting the cost:—

‘ April 25, 1834.

‘ My dear Sir,—I understand that the slander and abuse with which I have so long been assailed, in the public prints and in private gossip, has lately been extended to my chaplains, and all who are in any way connected with me, and that you in particular have been reviled in the foulest language.

‘I am not surprised at this: for though it is true I have always wished to preserve to every man the right of acting, as I endeavour to do myself, on the dictates of an unbiassed conscience, and am so far from requiring those connected with me to profess or do anything they think wrong, in compliance to me, that I should scorn any one I thought capable of such conduct; still I know there is a large portion of the public so incapable of even conceiving such principles as those I act on, that they take it for granted I must have in view some object of private ambition or interest, and must be labouring to form a party, consisting of men equally unprincipled.

‘And by this time my persecutors must be beginning to learn that on myself none of their calumny and insult

have any influence ; so that they are driven to try whether they cannot deter others from co-operating with me.

‘I can well conceive that it may be a severe trial to yourself or to some others to sustain all this obloquy, from some perhaps whom you may have been accustomed to look up to, or to act with. And my present object in writing this, is to declare to you distinctly, that if you find your situation as my chaplain—a situation through which I meant to engage you not in *my* service but in that of our common Master—exposes you to more ill-usage than you are prepared to endure, you are perfectly free to resign it, without any quarrel between us being the result. I know that you have much to undergo, and I cannot tell how much more you may have, from the unrelenting animosity with which I have no doubt I shall continue to be assailed. I wish you therefore at once to count the cost of your connection with me : if you find it best not to continue it, the sooner it is broken off the better for all parties ; and be assured that, in that case, I shall feel for you compassion unmixed with resentment. If, on the contrary, you are disposed to the opposite conclusion, I wish you to recollect that I have given you fair warning, and that you must make up your mind to endure such treatment and such language, from persons professing an ardent zeal for Christianity, as would be enough to make a tolerably civilised heathen abhor the very name of Christian.

‘For myself, I am resolved, by God’s help, that, as nothing ever yet did, nothing ever shall intimidate or provoke me, or in any way divert or deter me from pursuing the course which my own judgment and conscience prescribe.

‘I should add, that I foresaw from the first, and fully made up my mind to encounter, such a sea of troubles in

my present situation, as no temporal objects could have induced me—even with a greater certainty of attainment than any temporal objects can have—to encounter, even for the two years and a half that I have already been here. I fully resolved, therefore, to put my hand to the plough, and not to look back ; and I fully trust that I shall be strengthened to persevere, “through evil report and good report,” as long as it shall please Providence to spare my life and faculties.

‘I have spoken thus much of myself, contrary to my own taste and practice, on account of the connection now subsisting between us, that we may fully understand each other, and that you may be prepared to make your decision with as distinct a view as I can give you of all the circumstances of each alternative.’

The correspondence with Dr. Newman, which follows, needs no explanation. The general rule observed in this work has been to insert no letters but those of Archbishop Whately ; but, in this case, Dr. Newman’s answer to his first letter could not be omitted without making the whole appear confused :—

*To Rev. J. H. Newman, B.D.*

‘Dublin : Oct. 25, 1834.

‘My dear Newman,—A most shocking report concerning you has reached me, which, indeed, carries such an improbability on the face of it that you may perhaps wonder at my giving it a thought ; and at first I did not, but finding it repeated from different quarters, it seems to me worth contradicting for the sake of your character.

‘Some Oxford undergraduates, I find, openly report that when I was at Oriel last spring you absented yourself

from chapel on purpose to avoid receiving the communion along with me, and that you yourself declared this to be the case. I would not notice every idle rumour, but this has been so confidently and so long asserted that it would be a satisfaction to me to be able to declare its falsity as a fact, from your authority. I did indeed at once declare my utter unbelief, but then this has only the weight of my opinion; though an opinion resting, I think, on no insufficient grounds. I did not profess to rest my disbelief on our long, intimate, and confidential friendship, which would make it your right and your duty, if I did anything to offend you, or anything you might think materially wrong, to remonstrate with me; but on your general character, which I was persuaded would have made you incapable, even had no such close connection existed between us, of conduct so unchristian and inhuman. But, as I said, I should like for your sake to be able to contradict the report from your authority.

‘Ever yours very truly,

‘R. WHATELY.’

‘Oriental College: Oct. 28, 1834.

‘My dear Lord,—My absence from the Sacrament in the College Chapel on the Sunday you were in Oxford, was occasioned solely and altogether by my having it on that day in St. Mary’s; and I am pretty sure, if I may trust my memory, that I did not even know of your Grace’s presence there till after the service. Most certainly such knowledge would not have affected my attendance. I need not say, this being the case, that the report of my having made any statement on the subject is quite unfounded; indeed, your letter of this morning is the first information I have had in any shape of the existence of the report.

‘I am happy in being thus able to afford an explanation as satisfactory to you as the kind feelings which you have ever entertained towards me could desire; yet, on honest reflection, I cannot conceal from myself that it was generally a relief to me to see so little of your Grace, when you were in Oxford, and it is a greater relief now to have an opportunity of saying so to yourself. I have ever wished to observe the rule, never to make a public charge against another behind his back; and though, in the course of conversation and the urgency of accidental occurrences, it is sometimes difficult to keep to it, yet I trust I have not broken it, especially in your own case: *i.e.*, though my most intimate friends know how deeply I deplore the line of ecclesiastical policy adopted under your archiepiscopal sanction, and though in society I may have clearly shown that I have an opinion one way rather than the other, yet I have never in my intention, never (as I believe) at all, spoken of your Grace in a serious way before strangers; indeed, mixing little in general society, and not over-apt to open myself in it, I have had little temptation to do so. Least of all should I so forget myself, as to take undergraduates into my confidence in such a matter.

‘I wish I could convey to your Grace the mixed and very painful feelings which the late history of the Irish Church has raised in me—the union of her members with men of heterodox views, and the extinction (without ecclesiastical sanction) of half her candlesticks,<sup>1</sup> the witnesses and guarantees of the Truth and trustees of the Covenant. I willingly own, that both in my secret judg-

<sup>1</sup> By the Irish Church Temporalities Act (passed August 14, 1833), two archbishoprics were prospectively abolished, and the suffragan bishoprics reduced by consolidation from eighteen to ten.

ment and my mode of speaking concerning you to my friends, I have had great alternations and changes of feeling—defending, then blaming your policy, next praising yourself and protesting against your measures, according as the affectionate remembrances which I had of you rose against my utter aversion of the secular and unbelieving policy in which I considered the Irish Church to be implicated. I trust I shall never be forgetful of the kindness you uniformly showed me during your residence in Oxford, and anxiously hope that no duty to Christ and His Church may ever interfere with my expression of it. However, on the present opportunity, I am conscious to myself that I am acting according to the dictates both of duty and gratitude, if I beg your leave to state my persuasion, that the perilous measures in which your Grace has acquiesced are but the legitimate offspring of those principles, difficult to describe in few words, with which your reputation is associated; principles which bear upon the very fundamentals of all argument and investigation, and affect almost every doctrine and every maxim by which our faith and our conduct depend. I can feel no reluctance to confess that, when I first was connected with your Grace, gratitude to you and admiration of your character weighed strongly upon me; and, had not something from within resisted, I should certainly have adopted views on religious and social questions, such as seem to my present judgment to be based on the pride of reason and tending towards infidelity, and which in your own case nothing but your Grace's high religious temper and the unclouded faith of your mind have been able to withstand. I am quite confident that, however you may regret my judgment, you will give me credit not only for honesty, but for a deeper feeling, in thus laying it before you.

‘May I be suffered to add that your name is ever mentioned in my prayers, and to subscribe myself,

‘Your Grace’s very sincere friend and servant,

‘JOHN H. NEWMAN?’

‘October 1834.

‘My dear N.,—I cannot refrain from writing again, to express the great satisfaction I feel in the course I adopted, which has, eventually, put it in my power to contradict—as of course I shall—a report which was more prevalent and more confidently upheld than I could have supposed possible ; and which, while it was, perhaps, likely to hurt my character with some persons, was injurious to yours in the eyes of those of a more Christian temper.

‘For what idea must any one have had of religion—or at least of your religion—who was led to believe there was any truth in the imputation to you of such uncharitable arrogance ?

‘But it is a rule with me not to cherish, even on the strongest assertions, any belief, or even suspicion, to the prejudice of one whom I have any reason to think well of, till I have carefully inquired and dispassionately heard both sides. And I think, if others were to adopt the same rule, I should not myself be quite so much abused as I have been. I am well aware, indeed, that one cannot expect all, even good men, to think alike on every point, even after they shall have heard both sides, and that we may expect many to judge, after all, very harshly of those who do differ from them ; for, God help us, what will become of men if they receive no more mercy than they show to each other ! But, at least, if the rule were observed, men would not condemn a brother on mere vague popular rumour about principles (as in my case), “difficult

to describe in few words, and with which his reputation is associated." My own reputation I know is associated very extensively with what are in fact calumnious imputations, originating in exaggerated, misrepresented, or absolutely false statements, for which even those who circulate them admit, for the most part, that they have no other ground than popular rumour; like the Roman Jews, "As for this way, we know that it is everywhere spoken against." For I have ascertained that a very large proportion of those who join in the outcry against my works, confess, or even boast, that they have never read them. And in respect of the measure you advert to, the Church Temporalities Act (which, of course, I shall not now discuss), it is curious to see how many of those who load me with censure for acquiescing in it, receive with open arms and laud to the skies the Primate, who was consulted—as was natural, considering his influence and his long experience in Irish affairs—long before me, and gave his consent to the measure, differing from Ministers only on a point of detail—whether the revenues of six sees or of ten should be alienated. Of course every one is bound ultimately to decide according to his own judgment, nor do I mean even to shelter myself under his example; but only to point out what strange notions of justice those have who acquit with applause the leader, and condemn the follower, in the same individual transaction.

‘Far be it from any follower of Our Master to feel surprise or anger at any treatment of this kind; it is only an admonition to me to avoid treating others in a similar manner, and not to judge another’s servant, at least without a fair hearing.

‘You do me no more than justice in feeling confident that I shall give you credit both for “honesty” and for

“a deeper feeling,” in freely laying your opinions before me; and besides this, you might also have been confident from your own long experience, that long since—when ever it was that you changed your judgment respecting me—if you had freely and calmly remonstrated with me on any point where you thought me going wrong, I should have listened to you with that readiness and candour and respect which, as you well know, I always showed in the times when “we took sweet counsel together, and walked in the house of God as friends;” when we consulted together about so many practical measures, and about almost all the principal points in my publications.

‘I happen to have before me a letter from you just eight years ago, in which, after saying that “there are few things you wish more sincerely than to be known as a friend of mine,” and adding a much more flattering account of benefits derived from me than I can pretend to merit, you bear a testimony, which I certainly can most heartily agree in, as far at least as relates to the *freedom* of our intercourse and the readiness and respect with which you were listened to. Your words are: “Much as I owe to Oriel in the way of mental improvement, to none, as I think, do I owe so much as to yourself. I know who it was first gave me heart to look about me after my election, and taught me to think correctly, and—strange office for an instructor!—to rely upon myself. Nor can I forget that it has been at your kind suggestion that I have since been led to employ myself in the consideration of several subjects which I cannot doubt have been very beneficial to my mind.”

‘If in all this I was erroneous, if I have misled you or any one else into the “pride of reason,” or any other kind of pride, or if I have entertained, or led others to

entertain, any erroneous opinions, I can only say I am sincerely sorry for it. And I rejoice if I have been the means of contributing to form in any one that "high religious temper and unclouded faith" of which I not only believe, with you, that they are able to withstand tendencies towards infidelity, but also that, *without them*, no correctness of abstract opinions is of much value. But what I now mean to point out is, that there was plainly nothing to preclude you from offering friendly admonition when your views of my principles changed, with a full confidence of being at least patiently and kindly listened to.

'I, for my part, could not bring myself to find relief in avoiding the society of an old friend, with whom I had been accustomed to frank discussion, on account of my differing from him as to certain principles—whether through a change in *his* views or (much more) in *my own*—till, at least, I had made full trial of private remonstrance and free discussion. Even a man that is a heretic, we are told, even the ruler of a Church is not to reject till after repeated admonitions.

'But though your regard for me falls so short of what mine would have been under similar circumstances, I will not, therefore, reject what remains of it. Let us pray for each other, that it may please God to enlighten whichever of us is in any point in error, and recall him to the truth; and that, at any rate, we may hold fast that charity without which all faith that can subsist apart from it (though enough to remove mountains), and all knowledge, will profit us nothing.'

In connection with the principal subject of these letters, we may here quote some remarks found in the Archbishop's notebook on the Church Temporalities Bill, which had so greatly alarmed English High Churchmen:—

*‘On Church Temporalities.’*

‘I, in common with all those who had voted for the Church Temporalities Act, were cried out against as traitors, by those who got up the tracts as the organ of those that deprecated the “extinguishing of some of the lamps of the Church!”—the suppression of some of the Irish sees. These very men knew, if they took the trouble to make even the slightest inquiry, that this very act was framed by the then Ministry, under the sanction and approbation of the Primate, long before I had ever even heard of it! But then he did not *vote* for it in the House, as I did, because he was not then a member. I remember when Dickinson was at Oxford with me—the only time he was—he and —— had some conversation about that act, which had then recently passed; and —— said it was an unjustifiable thing to pass it without the consent of the Church. This, unless he meant that the first step should be to give the Church a representative government, which would be more desirable than practicable, being just a declaration that no act relative to the Church should ever be passed; for it is manifest that, as things now stand, the consent of the Church cannot possibly be obtained, or even *asked*. We observed, in reply, that, first, the attempt to continue levying church-rates was vain; secondly, that to go without them implied letting the churches fall to ruins, unless the English would make a grant of money to supply the want. But they only contributed fine speeches and tracts. Bishop —— spoke for four hours, and others were very eloquent also, and the Tractites wrote about the removing of candlesticks; but as for coming down with the *money*, nobody thought of that. It was cheaper to declaim against the horrible enormity of suppressing bishoprics and taxing benefices.’

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

*On an Article contributed to a Review, and curtailed by  
the Editor.*

‘Dublin : Wednesday, Nov. 21, 1834.

‘That a suit of clothes does not fit me, I should find out by experience of not being able to get them on ; but I may catch cold in the meantime. And Agamemnon incurred a worse fate by not knowing beforehand that he could not get his hands through the sleeves.

‘*We three* are agreed that the article is (however mutilated) not only one of the best-written we ever saw, but calculated to be of great use, by letting people perceive *at once* what they may else have to learn by troublesome if not dangerous experiment. We therefore advise its being published (uncurtailed) as a pamphlet, which may be circulated among some who do not take in the “Morning Chronicle,” and which also may be laid by, by those who do not file papers, for it is often a great search to find a newspaper of even a few days back. They are, like Jargonelle pears, very plentiful, but don’t keep.

‘I think, as soon as the Tory ministry is formed, the Education Board should apply, peremptorily, to know whether the system should go on, and will be supported ; since we should be parties to a fraud in encouraging people to establish schools in expectation of aid, which we should know they could not calculate upon. They will then be compelled either to avow (if they dare) their design to abandon the plan, or else to give it their sanction, which will be great good. What think you of this?’

‘If the change of ministry, as it has been brought about, be a scheme, it is a most unwise one, for it tends to indicate the late Cabinet to have had more strength

than most supposed it had ; for if you are sure a man is dying of consumption, why should you strangle him ? ’

‘ Dublin : Dec. 5, 1834.

‘ My dear Senior,—I send you, as you inquire about the Irish Church, an article, signed H. W., by a clergyman in very high repute, rather opposed to the late Ministry, and whose letters to me I referred to in my evidence. I also sent to several of the ministers a pamphlet of his in the form of a letter to Secretary Stanley. I should add that he finds the majority of his own admirers alarmed at his views.

‘ I believe, however, that (before the late change) very many of the clergy deplored the rejection of the Tithe Bill, which, though a hard measure, they had come to think was better than anything else they had to expect. *Now*, a large portion of the Protestant ascendancy party among them are wild with exultation, and many of them, not the less, from the prospect of a civil war. But the state of public feeling is the more alarming, inasmuch as if the new Ministry sail on the *one* tack, there is to be apprehended a union of Whigs and ultra-Radicals ; if on the other, of ultra-Radicals and Orangemen. . . . For those last are disposed to be much more desperate than ever before, if anything like Whig measures are pursued by a Tory ministry ; thus taking away the hope on which they had hitherto fed, of a change of measures from an eventual change of ministry. . . . There has been, indeed, for some time a degree of flirtation going on between the extreme leaders of both those parties. The following straw may serve to show how the wind sits. A certain literary society, professing merely literary objects, but consisting very much of men of strong radical views, offered me (just after the late change) the honour of being

one of their vice-presidents, which I declined. The truth is, I did not wish spontaneously to place myself in a situation in which I might be called on to act with Mr. O'Connell (who is a V.P.) as my colleague. Whereupon they conferred the honour on Mr. ——. “Then said the olive-tree, ‘Shall I leave my fruit and my fatness, which rejoiceth God and man, to go and be king over the trees?’” etc. And so some have given him the *sobriquet* of Bramble B.

‘The apprehension does not seem so strong here as in England, but still it is very considerable, that the high Tories will be disappointed in the measures of the new ministry, and that whoever takes charge of the seals will become a Proteus.

‘Should a different set of men shortly succeed, I think it would be madness to accept office again, under the disheartening condition of playing with a pack of cards picked and sorted by an opponent. An infusion of new peers first, and, subsequently, the former of my two suggestions (the latter should be left to soak several years) ought to be indispensable; so should yours. It is absurd that a member should lose his seat by accepting office; but besides this, I think every minister should have a seat as such (and so also every member of a commission, when matters connected with that commission are debated), and a right to speak, though not to vote unless a member. And the dissolution of a Parliament on the occasion of demise is a most mischievous absurdity.

‘A new king being at liberty to dissolve Parliament if he see fit, why force him to do so, when it is likely to be peculiarly inconvenient?’

‘My dear Senior,—I understand that — is pertinaciously resolved, in case the present ministry stands, to

resign his place, saying he cannot hold office under a Tory ministry, and that he is sure they will cripple all our operations. This last is a prophecy very likely to lead to its own fulfilment; for if the ministry perceive that he (and, by-the-bye, Mr. More O'Ferrall also) consider the whole commission as a party scheme, they are likely to act accordingly; and whatever evils ensue, the blame will rest with those who strike the first blow. If we were all to go on quietly till some improper interference is attempted, perhaps—I should say probably—none will be attempted; but at any rate the blame of breaking up the commission (which ought to be, and always has been, as far as my influence could go, unconnected with party) cannot be shifted from ministers to us.

‘I wish any friend of —— could persuade him not to favour so mischievous a system as that of making every measure, plan, institution, &c., break up and come to nothing in every change of ministry. He talks of returning to his situation should a Whig ministry be replaced; but I think it would be a very bad precedent to readmit him, after he had resigned it on party grounds.

‘As for holding office “under Tories,” he might as well expect a commander of a ship to resign his commission on each change of ministry. I suppose when the Radicals come in they will exact an oath of allegiance to themselves from all public servants, on pain of dismissal.

‘What I have been writing need not be kept secret.

‘I wrote you two letters to Bowood. I have since seen persons who have more hopes of the forming of a broad-bottomed administration that shall obtain general confidence.’

‘Palace : Nov. 30, 1834.

‘My dear Senior,—There certainly is force in the objection against your being known as a political writer ; and this will always remain in force. Indeed, I never contemplated a *deferred* publication ; if it could do any good, it would be by nipping in the bud the present attempt.

‘As there are times in which one does not know what opportunities or emergencies may arise, I will lay before you two suggestions which, if I could engraft on some clever young semi-radical to throw into a pamphlet, the public might ruminate upon, till perhaps they might be applied :—

‘1. We have often discussed the problem how to keep a constitutional check on the House of Lords, without so crippling as to render it useless as a drag-chain ; which I should be sorry to do, rumbling down-hill, as we have been, and are. Now I think one single vote of that House might place a rule on their books which should settle the matter. Let it be made a standing rule that the dissent of the House of Lords is *given beforehand*, and shall be duly signified by the proper officers, to any bill which shall not be certified to have passed the House of Commons under the following circumstances—viz., that it shall so have passed the House of Commons the *former* session, as well as again the present ; secondly, that special notice of this shall have been given, and a special call of the House of Commons previous to its being the second time proposed ; thirdly, that the Lords, on throwing out, wholly or partly, any bill brought from the Commons, should be at liberty to enter a protest (as the *minority* of them are now), which should be read in the other House previous to the bill being again brought on ;

and fourthly, that an *absolute* majority of the *whole* House of Commons should have voted for the bill the second time. These points being duly certified to the House of Lords, the bill to be considered as passed, without any debate.

‘ This might be called, but very unfairly, a limitation of the power of the House of Lords. It is, in truth, only a more decorous, and less humiliating and less troublesome and dangerous, mode of intimating to them, what every one knows is the case, that if the Lower House is deliberately and fully resolved, the Upper *must* give way. It is stopping the House by a woo-ee, instead of a sharp pull of the curb. But that a *hasty* resolve of the House of Commons should be checked by the Lords, is, I think, most desirable.

‘ 2. Now for an equally advantageous vote of the other House. My bill is to enact that, first, such-and-such laws shall be enrolled on the list of *fundamental*; secondly, no motion admissible for the repeal or alteration or enactment of any fundamental law; but thirdly, a motion may be made to appoint a select committee to consider of the expediency of removing any law from the list of fundamentals; if carried, fourthly, such committee to deliver in their report the ensuing session; fifthly, if report favourable to such removal, that removal may be proposed, but shall not be considered as carried except by the votes of an *absolute* majority; sixthly, if so carried, the law is still in force, but liable to repeal, like any other non-fundamental; seventhly, the same process requisite for placing any existing law on that list. I suppose you know the nature and the important use of a flywheel: this is my mode of supplying the want of one in our constitution.

‘ As to the Education Board, Lord Rosslyn’s goodwill would not avail unless supported by the Treasury. I do

not myself think that if a Tory cabinet is formed they will *venture* to supply such a topic of agitation as the suppression of the board would furnish. It might cost His Majesty as much as *half-a-crown*. But if they stay in (as is most likely) not more than two or three months, they may, when out again, plague us as much as ever, and boast of what they *would* have done; whereas, let us once get their sanction, and their mouths are stopped; the chief benefit of which will be, that many Protestants will join the plan who are now intimidated.

‘R. W.’

The winter of this year brought him a deep and unlooked-for trial. His valued friend Blanco White suddenly announced to him that he had embraced Socinian views, and that, in consequence, he thought it best to give up his residence in the family and remove to Liverpool, where many of his new friends resided. It may easily be imagined that this was a blow of no ordinary kind to the friends with whom he had so long lived as a brother.

The Archbishop's steady and unswerving faith in the atonement and divinity of the Lord Jesus Christ; his deep sense of the vital importance of that doctrine as the groundwork of the Christian scheme, and of the impossibility of any honest interpretation of the New Testament without admitting it, were such as to make him mourn his friend's defection with heartfelt sorrow; but the circumstances attending it were of a more than usually painful character. For many months previously he had been in a state of excitement and irritability of nerves, with occasional incoherency, which could not but cause much alarm to his friends; the mental struggles which he had undergone throughout a life marked by trials of no ordinary

kind, had evidently unhinged his mind and shaken to the utmost his always sensitive organisation.

It has frequently been alleged that the friends of this afflicted man 'gave him up' on this declaration of his change of sentiments, and in particular that the Archbishop did so. So much are the true facts the reverse of this misrepresentation, that, perhaps, seldom has a bewildered and tried sufferer been the subject of tenderer or more thoughtful care from his nearest relations, than this solitary exile received from those who were bound to him by no ties save those of friendship. His own feelings and wishes made it impossible for him to reside among them, and such an intimate association could have been productive of nothing but pain on either side; but from the time of his removal to Liverpool, to his death in 1841, he was supported partly by a pension from the Archbishop, and partly by one from another friend. He maintained an affectionate and frequent correspondence with the family at Redesdale, as well as with most of his other friends. Whenever any of the Archbishop's family were passing through Liverpool they visited him; and a note dictated from his deathbed, and showing the same affectionate sympathy and confidence in them all, is now in the writer's possession.

But the letters which follow will speak for themselves. For convenience' sake, we have put those together which were addressed by the Archbishop to Mr. B. White on this painful subject.

## CHAPTER VIII.

1835.

Letters to Rev. J. Blanco White on his Unitarian views, and consequent secession from the Church.

‘ Dublin : January 15, 1835.

‘ MY DEAR FRIEND,—When you arrange your style of living, pray make use of that formula which is so much praised and so seldom thought of in practice, of considering what you would wish me to do, if we were to change places. You will then, I am sure, recollect, that since each mutton-chop you eat does not cost me more now, than when you ate it in my house, and since it would have been certainly no gratification to me then, that you should eat a chop the less from regard to my pocket, so neither can it be so now. It is true there are persons from whom you would accept an invitation to dinner at their houses, from whom you would not accept anything else ; but I am not in that list ; and from him from whom you will condescend to accept a sixpence you need not scruple at a shilling, on any other ground than a belief that he could not afford it.

‘ I have suggested to Mr. Zulueta,<sup>1</sup> in a note accompanying the books (and from what I have seen of his letters, struggling with an imperfect command of English, he strikes me as a most uncommonly common-sense man), that perhaps a translation into Spanish might be worth while, with a view, if not to Spain direct, at least to the

<sup>1</sup> A Spanish friend of Mr. Blanco White.

colonies. I am inclined to think that the sun of right reason will rise on Spain from the West.

‘As to your other matters of deliberation, I will say no more than to recommend you to keep close to an adviser whom you can hardly find fault with—yourself I mean—for the present; that you should read what you think fit, and reflect in private, and, if you see cause, go to hear preachers of any denomination; but not discuss personally, yet a while, either orally or by letter, the theological and ecclesiastical questions with which you are occupied with anybody. I really do not think you strong enough, at present, to bear the excitement of a controversial discussion with any one who might be disposed, however mildly and candidly, to oppose your views; and I need hardly add, that to keep aloof from these, and to hold intercourse with those, and those only, who coincide with you, or are prepared to adopt whatever you propose, would not be giving yourself a fair chance for attaining truth. You have practically adopted this recommendation, in some degree (and wisely, if the above view be a just one), in abstaining from the discussion of the subjects alluded to, with Wilson, Dickinson, myself, &c.; and it is almost superfluous to add, that Mr. Armstrong, or any one else of his school, though he may be right and I wrong, cannot be deserving of more of your confidence than your friends here.

‘Then why should I mention at all what seems so obvious? Because you are a lion; and it is but the part of a friend to warn you of the traps, however well qualified you may be to take care of your own steps yourself, which are set to catch a lion for a show. When first you quitted the Romish Church you were made a Protestant lion of; and you have often laughed at the “no-popery” folks here who talked of “bringing over B. W.” to go

about as a missionary, &c. But they would not have talked in the same style to you, if they had, at that time, made a serious effort to catch you. You would have been assailed by—what is, I think, a far severer trial than persecution, to any one who has any spirit—that cordial, I will not say flattery (for it would have been sincere), but unmixed and unbounded praise and veneration, which addresses itself at once to two of the most powerful principles within us—our desire of self-complacent feelings towards our own character, and our benevolent sympathy with others ; taking in, phrenologically speaking, good part of the forehead, and most of the occiput.

‘ To apologize for the freedom with which I write, would not be to treat you as a friend. The least hint that anything I say is taken amiss, or that what is meant as a warning against a trial is taken as in fact an imputation of weakness, will stop me at once.

‘ I have told Senior the tale of the two goats (do you remember it?) who met on a narrow ledge on the face of a cliff, when there was no room to pass or retreat ; and after a pause of great interest to the spectators, one goat lay down for the other to walk over. It would do for a hieroglyphic frontispiece.

‘ Mrs. Whately rather gains ground than not, but is still weak.

‘ Ever your affectionate,

‘ R. W.

‘ P.S.—The kindest inquiries are made for you (and indeed have long been, though I have not reported them to you) by most of the clergy.’

‘ Dublin: January 20, 1835.

‘ My dear Friend,—What do you think? I have written to Sir R. Peel, sending copies of my “ Punishments,” and exhorting him to immortalize himself by

taking steps to remove this crying evil. If he goes out, I think there can be no harm done; if he stays in, there may be good.

‘You are, perhaps, envying us our mild climate, but I promise you there is a good English frost here as you would wish to see.

‘While writing, I must correct one mistake you made as to my meaning in my last. I was very far from meaning to hint that you had not read (more probably, by a great deal, than are worth reading) the writers on both sides in the Trinitarian controversies. What I said was in substance, “Read books or hear sermons, or meditate in private, just as much or as little as you please but do not discuss personally, either in conversation or by letter, any points with the one party which you do not so discuss with the other.” I dare say I did not express myself with any great precision, but I wonder at your not recollecting how many, many times I have said, that nothing, in my opinion, tends so much to dispose an intelligent mind towards anti-Trinitarian views as the Trinitarian works.

‘With regard to the advice I did mean to take the liberty of giving, it might perhaps be answered, that those who have no benefices to lose may safely be consulted, though not those who have. But I would reply, that there are many other feelings likely to bias a man’s judgment besides mere interest—such as ambition of taking a lead, desire of celebrity, being influential in the world—that pertinacity in maintaining a position taken up, which Thucydides calls φιλονεικία—a feeling of heroism in encountering a sort of martyrdom, and making sacrifices, the consciousness of which supports and consoles ascetics of all kinds, &c., &c.

‘All these are feelings as likely and more so to bias some minds, as bodily comfort and worldly profit others.

‘For myself, though I presume not to say how far I am prepared to “pluck out the eye or cut off the hand that offend me,” I feel convinced of this, that as far as external persuasions go, the temptations to separate from the Church are at least as strong as those towards adherence to it; I mean to a man of my disposition. In point of wealth, the revenues of the see have made no difference (for the better at least) in my bodily ease and comfort; state and splendour, &c., are a mere inconvenience to me. My patrimony, though not large, is enough to afford me a subsistence. If I wished to increase my income I could take pupils, who would give me probably much less trouble than those I now have. My children will probably be nothing the richer for the archbishopric; and as for good report and evil report, I verily think I should have less obloquy to encounter than now; for after the first yell had a little subsided, many even of the most intolerant bigots would be so glad to be rid of me, that they would be ready not only to forgive but to praise my open secession. And then, what an illustrious seceder, what an heroic martyr, what a valued advocate would an archbishop, and he an author of celebrity, become! All the adversaries of the Establishment (who are not few) would receive me with loud cheers, however their own opinions might differ from each other or from mine. There would be the common bond of common hostility, and all friends and foes would give me credit for most magnanimous and disinterested self-devotion; for whatever feelings of vanity, ambition, love of glory, or resentment, I might be influenced by, these are never called interested motives. On the other side, I have to endure opposition, insult, calumny, suspicion, contempt, hatred, from the violent, the thoughtless, the weak, the worldly, the partisans of all sides; and what (in a worldly point of view) is my reward? To wear lawn-

sleeves and be called “Your Grace!”—ornaments which, however honourable, are not at all less so to him who voluntarily lays them down, than to him who wears them. I strive and pray to take an unbiassed course of duty; but, as far as external inducements go, the circumstances tending to bias me are, as far as I can judge, not preponderant on the side I have as yet taken. I hope to act without prejudice, but sure I am the causes leading to prejudice are not all on one side. In your case, when you were in Spain you had much more to sacrifice, and apparently less worldly compensation. Yet I think had I known you then, I should have paid you the compliment of discussing with you (supposing I had found you perfectly ready and willing) questions involving your continuance in that church. However, I do not at all mean that we should run the risk of unsettling the minds of those unaccustomed to steady reflection and logical reasoning, by suddenly putting before them in a startling form, before they “are able to bear it,” the whole of such views as, however just, they may not be able at once fully to embrace. To recur to an illustration I have often used, a clown who is taught that the sun stands still, before he can be brought to comprehend and believe his own motion round the earth’s axis, is much more perplexed than instructed, and is bewildered by the alternations of day and night. Señor Zulueta will need your help in English, if not in political economy. I am much gratified to hear of his design.

‘ Ever your affectionate

‘ R. W.’

‘ March 5, 1835.

‘ My dear Friend,—I understand from Mr. Z. that you are thinking of publishing a theological work earlier than I had anticipated. In begging you now to let me look

over the whole of the MS. before it is sent to the press, I hope and trust I am saying what is superfluous, and only anticipating an offer on your part to the same effect. In that case, I entreat you not to impute this application to any suspicion of your deliberately designing to act unfairly towards me, by refusing me the confidence which I am conscious of deserving. But it strikes me as just possible—though I hope not probable—that some notion of my being too much occupied to bestow the requisite attention on your work, may induce you to think that I should not wish to look over it in MS. My avocations, indeed, are many; but let this consideration operate only to prompt you to afford me the earliest possible opportunity of reading what you propose to publish. You should not, and I trust cannot, suppose that, where the cause of religious truth is involved, I would not find or make leisure to attend to the subject.

‘Some, indeed, of your former publications have gone to the press without my desiring to read the whole of them in MS.; but then these were works whose general drift and design I had beforehand been made fully acquainted with. For all the details of any work published by one who chanced to be an inmate of my house I did not feel myself responsible; and as for the great fundamental principles inculcated in them, I never had reason to suppose there was any material difference between us. But the present case, as you are yourself well aware, is quite the reverse. For the very ground of your leaving my house, was your contemplating a publication on the principles of which we should be likely to differ widely—a publication which you conceived would have committed me improperly, if sent forth while you were under my roof, even though accompanied with a disavowal of my concurrence. Now such a work, it is evident, ought not,

considering the terms on which we have lived together, to be published without my having the opportunity allowed me of first seeing it in MS., and discussing in a private and friendly way the subjects treated of; unless, indeed, we had (which you know is not the case) previously discussed them together in conversation, as we were accustomed to do such a variety of other subjects.

‘If, on submitting your MS., as I have been so long accustomed to submit to your inspection most of mine, to a free and friendly and candid examination, I should find myself differing from you on any point, and should, on stating my objections and hearing your answers, be disposed to adopt your views, you cannot but know me well enough to be sure that I should rejoice in an opportunity of being set right; and I am bound to think the same of you, should you, on the other hand, see reason to alter any opinion of yours. But should we both ultimately retain our opposite opinions, neither of us would have, after a fair and candid discussion, any ground of complaint; and you would have an additional advantage, in being able to say, when you did publish, that your opinions remained unaltered after you had given a fair hearing to all that could be urged on the other side, by a friend for whose sound judgment and candour, whatever others may think of them, you, at least, have always had the highest esteem. You might then make your appeal to the public, and I mine, without any moral impropriety being imputed to either of us.

‘But if, on the contrary (I beg you to understand that I am not anticipating this as probable), you should refuse me such a mark of confidence, the result of your publishing under such circumstances would be, as I am sure calm reflection will point out to you, most unspeakably unpleasant to both of us, and injurious to the cause of

truth to which we are both servants. \*For if a work of your's appeared, containing portions fundamentally at variance with what I have always maintained, without your being able to add, that we had previously discussed in private, either orally or by letter, the points at issue, and that we remained mutually unconvinced, and feeling bound each to adhere to what seems to him the truth, what inference would the public draw, and indeed be justified in drawing? Evidently that I must secretly hold your opinions, and have even been privately encouraging and fostering them, but that I was withheld by base worldly motives from an honest avowal of my sentiments. It would be in vain for you to say that you had never discussed the subject at all with me, nor even given me any reason to suspect the turn your opinions had taken, till you actually resolved to remove from my house ; for how could any one believe that you could have any adequate motive (not dishonouring to one or both of us) for such a suppression as this, accompanied by your subsequently withholding from me your papers? Should you reply, that you did not like to risk "unsettling my mind," instilling doubts which I might not be able satisfactorily to remove, and which might interfere with my comfort, this, it is obvious, might indeed be a fair reason for avoiding the discussion before you had decidedly made up your own mind, as to not only the adoption but the publication of your opinions ; but after you had thus resolved to publish your own opinions, supposing you to meet with no reason for changing them, then to refuse me (it would be said) the inspection of your MS. and a discussion of the subject of it, must be regarded, at the very best, as being on the face of it unkind and unhandsome treatment. For whoever thinks it right to publish, evidently thinks it right to run the risk, whatever that may be, of "unsettling the minds" of all who had

previously differed from the doctrines he publishes. No one in his senses would pretend to feel a scruple about unsettling the minds of one or two individuals by statements and arguments which he was designing at the very same time to publish, for the perusal both of those very individuals and of all others besides. This would indeed be blowing hot and cold with the same breath. It would be like scrupling to administer to a single patient a dose of some powerful and hazardous medicine, and at the same time impregnating with it the cisterns that supply water to the whole town.

‘But the interpretation that will, I think, be the most generally, and the most plausibly, put on such a procedure, would be, that you had abstained from all discussion with me, from a secret persuasion that though I did in my heart agree with you, yet you could not trust me honestly to declare my real sentiments, and therefore did not think me worth consulting. Those, again, who did not so interpret the transaction, would be left to conclude that you had shrunk from private discussion with me not through fear of your unsettling my mind, but lest I should unsettle yours, and adduce objections to which you might not find a ready answer against positions which you were resolved at all events to maintain.

‘These, and such as these, are surmises—indeed more than mere surmises—which it would be most unpleasant to set afloat without having any satisfactory mode of doing them away. For we must not forget, that when two persons have long lived together on terms of very close intimacy, the very least suspicion appearing to exist in the one party towards the other (even though much slighter than in the case I have been supposing), has, deservedly, more weight than the most distinct accusations brought by a stranger or mere common acquaintance.

“But what matters it,” some might reply, “what will be said?” To you I need hardly observe how little I have always regarded what people may choose to say of me, or of my friends, so long as it is manifest, or may be made manifest, that the censures passed on us are groundless. But in such a case as I have now been supposing, the unfavourable appearances are such as, I think, could not be satisfactorily explained.

‘The public would be not only left, but led, to conclude, that at least one of us (if not both) must be a most base and dishonourable, not to say treacherous, character.

*Pudet hæc opprobria nobis  
Et dici potuisse et non potuisse refelli.*

You must of course perceive, that whenever you may think fit to publish, if it be anything at variance with the principles I have maintained, I shall feel called on—considering the close intimacy in which we have lived—in mere justice to my own character, as well as to the cause of truth, to publish also, stating my assent or dissent. And if such a transaction should take place without your having permitted me any private discussion of the question at issue—if, in short, the public discussion shall have been the first discussion that was allowed between us—I shall be driven, in self-defence, to state publicly that this is the case: that both oral consultation has been avoided, and private inspection of the MS. denied me, without any reason that can, in my opinion, justify such a withdrawal of a confidence I had so long and, I must think, deservedly enjoyed.

‘And the imputations which the appearance of such a state of things could not fail to cast on one or both of us, there would be, I think, no way of satisfactorily removing.

‘Once more let me beg you not to suppose that I am

taking for granted you had meditated such a step as I have just described. If what I have said about it be superfluous (which I hope and trust it is), or if I have unnecessarily expressed myself more strongly than is agreeable to your feelings, I entreat you to pardon it, on the ground of my naturally feeling the strongest anxiety on a point so important, not only to me, but to yourself and the public.

‘Ever, my dear friend, most affectionately yours,

‘R. WHATELY.’

‘Dublin: March 10, 1835.

‘My dear Friend,—I am glad you mean to send me the MS. of your intended work. I had, indeed, as you observe, had access, some time since, to a MS.—of which I had read but a small part—of a work which you were designing to publish; but though I was fully intending to read the whole of it before it went to the press, I had, as you know, no reason (any more than I believe you had yourself) to suppose that there was any particular haste about it. And you will also remember that I had not the smallest suspicion of its containing (which indeed I believe it did not) anything implying separation from the Church, or of your meditating such a separation. A few additions and alterations, small in amount, may have given—as I suppose is the case—an entirely new turn, in that respect, to the whole work.

‘As for what you say of your unfitness for discussing, verbally, questions of an agitating character, I do indeed know very well that your shattered and enfeebled state of nerves is often such as to render much conversation on such points too exciting and exhausting to you; but this does not at all bear upon what I meant to say in my last letter. I was not at all dwelling on any distinction

between words written and words spoken ; and you must well remember how many points we have discussed together, for years past, on paper as well in oral discourse. MSS. of my own and of others, and pamphlets and books, very many, by various hands, I have laid before you to receive your remarks in pencil, and have made similar remarks in turn on MSS. of yours.

‘I cannot but remark to you, my dear friend, before I close this letter, how much I am alarmed and distressed beyond the intrinsic importance of each individual case, by finding you so often appearing of late to misunderstand the meaning of my letters, where I have every reason to think I had expressed myself with complete perspicuity. In one instance, you gave at large your reasons against following my advice as to the study of Bull, Waterland, and other writers in the Trinitarian controversy ; whereas Heaven knows I had never given you any such advice, or anything approaching to it, but had merely advised you against oral discussions, at present, with any one on those subjects.

‘Shortly afterwards, you mistook the sense of, I cannot but think, a very simple sentence in another letter, so as not only to reverse completely the meaning of it, but to make it utterly at variance with what went before and with what followed, and thus to convert a coherent and intelligible passage into a tissue of absurdity. . . . And in your last letter, when you are alluding to the unfavourable interpretations which I thought might be put on your conduct and on mine, in consequence of the publication of a work which should have been withheld from me, you seem to misunderstand entirely the grounds I stated for my apprehensions. For you allude to what I might think it my duty to do in order to remove suspicions injurious to my archiepiscopal character. Now, I never

said anything at all about my archiepiscopal character, or that had any bearing whatever upon anything connected with my station, or even with my profession. Were I a layman, in a private station, I should be unwilling, on the grounds I stated—as a Christian, as a man of honour, I might add as a man—to have imputations cast on my character, or on that of a friend, through any act of a person whom I esteemed and valued. The case was simply this, and it would have been the same even before I took orders: A man (suppose) has been living with me for years, on terms of the closest brotherly intimacy and supposed confidence. He publishes a work, we will suppose, proclaiming his separation from the Church, and disapprobation of its doctrines, without in any way discussing the question with me, or allowing me to see his work before publication; but of course the public are led to believe, if he does not expressly declare the contrary, that he did consult with his most confidential friend, and that I concur, or nearly concur, in his opinions, and may be expected, if I have honesty enough to avow my real sentiments, to secede from the Church also. But if, again, he does declare that he had never communicated with me at all on the subject, either orally or in writing, then it must appear that the person who knows me the most intimately has the most contemptuous opinion either of my understanding, or my sincerity, or both: such an impression could not but be injurious to the character of one at least, and most likely both of us. Such was the case I was stating, as I think you will see by referring to my letter; and it has evidently no reference to my station or profession, except as a Christian and an honest man.

‘It is, as I have said, not on account of the intrinsic importance of these points that I notice the misapprehensions; and I need not add how long I have known

you for a most critically accurate judge of language, and, again, one who would never willingly misinterpret any one. Whatever the cause may be, you will pardon me for putting you on your guard.

‘ Ever your affectionate,

‘ R. W.’

‘ Dublin: March 15, 1835.

‘ My dear Friend,—I did not see Mrs. W.’s letters to you, nor your last to her, and I have not asked her for a sight of it, because I would not without necessity agitate a painful subject. But I wish to assure you that you must have entirely mistaken the meaning of one or both of us, if you have entertained the slightest suspicion that we are disposed to withdraw our friendship from you—or indeed from any one—on the ground of a difference in religious opinion; or that we have any need to be admonished as to the duty of Christian love, and more especially love towards you; or that I have ever expressed or felt any disposition to dictate to the conscience of another, and control his freedom of judgment. I have suppressed, in tenderness to you, the greater part of what we have felt on your account. Could you know the daily and nightly anguish we have suffered, or the half of it, and how much it has arisen from sympathy with what you have suffered, and dread of the far greater evils anticipated to you, I am sure you would have no doubts of our affection. But you will see, on looking at my last two letters, at least if it is in my power by any effort to make myself intelligible, that what I so earnestly deprecated was, not your holding some opinion different from mine, but your proclaiming to the world that you had no confidence in me. Had you published anything that had been to the last altogether withheld from me, both orally and in writing, declaring at the same time (as you must have done, in

order to remove the impression of my coinciding with your views) that such had been the case, this would have been the strongest possible declaration of a complete distrust of me—either morally or intellectually, if not both—on the part of one who might be expected, if any one could, to know me well. And I did not represent this (as you seem to have apprehended me) as a “possible interpretation” of such a proceeding: I did not regard it as merely possible, or as merely probable, but as inevitable. One person might “possibly” have concluded that you held my understanding in contempt, and another my sincerity; and a third, perhaps, might have avoided both these suppositions by attaching the worst imputations to yourself; but I cannot see—and I think any impartial friend whom you may consult will say the same—how one or another of these unfavourable interpretations could have been avoided.

‘But I all along said, as you will see by referring to my letters, that a mere difference of opinion (should any such ultimately exist) need not leave cause for complaint on either side. I say, should any such exist, because I really have no precise notion what your opinions are. But should they be such as to call for a separation from the church of which we have been fellow-members, no unprejudiced person could have failed, I think, to be shocked (considering the terms on which we have lived) at my having the first knowledge of them from a printed and published book.

‘It is this that I am anxious to avoid. Judge of me, I beseech you, my dear friend, by what I have myself written and said and done during our long and close intimacy. Judge of me for yourself, as you have the means of doing, and are therefore bound to do. I do not grudge you any benefit you derive from your new friends; I do not doubt the sincerity of the admiration they bestow on

you. But I am convinced you will never find any more steadily attached to you, or more worthy of your confidence, or more prepared to stand by you under trying circumstances, than myself. And they cannot be so well qualified to judge of my character as you are yourself. Do not then, I entreat you, let any one persuade you that every bishop and beneficed clergyman must be presumed to be an intolerant bigot, or hypocritical, or narrow-minded. There are but too many of this description, no doubt, in our church, as there are in every church, sect, or party, religious or political; as there are also candid and liberal-minded men, who are, thence, the more unwilling to suspect others of wanting such qualities. For it should not be forgotten, that one of the greatest breaches of charity is, rashly and without cause to impute want of charity to another. The ultra-high-church spirit, and the sectarian spirit, are but the same demon in different shapes; the one presuming that there is nothing good out of the Established Church, the other that there is nothing good within it. There is palliation, though not excuse, for many persons who have taken for granted that I must needs be a party-politician, out of gratitude, forsooth, to the ministers who appointed me—that I must delight in rank and title, and station and wealth, because these would be great temptations to themselves,—and that these temptations must bias my mind, and corrupt either my judgment or my integrity; because they have never known either me or any one not thus to be corrupted, and that I must be as intolerant as those they have been used to meet with. Those who judge thus are very culpable, certainly, in imputing to any one what they do not and cannot know to be true; but you have had the best opportunity of knowing it to be untrue. Permit me therefore to warn you, my dear friend, not to judge of

each person's freedom from intolerance of spirit by the vehemence with which he censures it, or the readiness with which he imputes it. None have complained more of persecution than those churches which have shown the greatest readiness to persecute when they attained the power. Nor is it any proof of our moderation that we do not inflict secular penalties on those who are out of our power. By loading them with harsh, reproachful, or contemptuous language, and expressing what we may denominate virtuous indignation, we may be exhibiting that bitterness of disposition which is just what we might expect would be displayed by those who are at heart dogmatical, dictatorial, intolerant, and uncharitable, when destitute of the power of displaying it otherwise than in words. I do not mean to assume that you actually entertain such suspicions of me as I have alluded to; but excuse my warning you, in case you should be associating with those whose tendencies do lie that way, that you may not be led to use expressions which may be understood as conveying a censure, which from you would be doubly unjust.

‘Ever your most affectionate friend,

‘R. W.’

*To the same.*

*Extract (speaking of a common friend).*

‘Dublin : March 24, 1835.

‘Poor —— ! His is one of the many cases in which I take pains to remind myself how much more important it is to try and learn from the errors of others than to dwell on our own supposed exemption. I think, and I am convinced any unbiassed judge would think, that his behaviour to me, considered in itself, has been bad ; but those he is surrounded with are mostly not unbiassed, and those who are must of course appear to him the least reasonable. I try to remind myself that it is not peculiar to him to

approve most those who most echo our own sentiments, and that his conduct accordingly does not strike him in the same light that it does me. He is doubtless not at all aware that he is open to flattery, and has bid adieu to the true humility which consists in self-distrust, and which once lost, leaves nothing behind that can be depended on to secure us from any conceivable excesses.

‘In his case I know not, such is his morbid constitution, what may be his degree of responsibility; but my own responsibility is the important point to myself. I wish he, and others, would always proceed on that plan recommended by Our Lord, and which you lately referred to, for settling a difference between brother and brother. Intimate as we were, he ought, as you did t’other day, and as I have always endeavoured to do, to have endeavoured to settle it “between him and me alone,” that each of us might have a chance of “gaining a brother.” It will often happen that in this way a wound may be healed, as the surgeons say, “by the first intention.” At all events it is a satisfaction not to have resorted in haste to the stronger measure of an appeal to the ecclesiastical or Christian public.

‘Ever yours affectionately,

‘R. W.’

The following letter relates to a book which Mr. B. White was at this time publishing, the title of which has not been learned :—

‘Redesdale: April 15, 1835.

‘My dear Friend,—When your packet arrived I was just about to answer your last letter, and I will therefore finish what I was about before I look over your preface.

‘I was thinking that I ought to declare to you, in respect of those persons in America who have assumed the appellation of Christians, that when I admitted that probably

many of them might not perceive the arrogant and insidious character of such a designation, I said all that in sincerity I could say. The same is the case with many probably of those who designate as Catholics the members of the Church of Rome. In either case many persons probably forget that the very use and design of an appellation is to distinguish one object or class of objects from another, and that consequently, though Christian may be a very proper appellation to distinguish those who call Christ master, from Pagans, Mahometans, &c., if any one body of Christians distinguish themselves by it they cannot but be understood as claiming to be either the only Christians, or, at least, more truly and properly so than others. That "Christians" therefore is the only denomination they assumed in the New Testament history, would be, if a correct statement, nothing to the purpose. (By-the-bye, you will see on a moment's reflection that, so far is it from being correct, the term Christian never even seems to have been applied to them by themselves at all, only by the unbelieving Gentiles. The Jews called them Nazarenes; they themselves used a variety of appellations, as "Saints," the "Called," the "Brethren," the "Church," "God's People," &c., but never "Christians." But were the fact otherwise, it would be nothing to the present purpose.) The object was to distinguish the followers of Jesus from the Pagans and Jews who rejected Him. Nor is it to the purpose that these of the "Christian denomination" are ready to receive any one who will join them. So are the Catholics. If indeed, in speaking of so many places of worship and so many thousand individuals of the "Christian denomination" in America, they included all who call themselves Christians, of whatever church or sect, there would be nothing invidious in the term. But it is plain they confine the name to those who do join them. But then, it is said, they have no creed—no subscription

to articles—no hard conditions imposed on those who choose to join them. Well, let it be granted that their society is formed on the most liberal and comprehensive plan; still if any one who may chance not to like the discourses of their ministers or the prayers of their congregations should decline to join them, he would not be reckoned by them among the number of those whom they designate as of the “Christian denomination.” It is plainly therefore an appellation by which they distinguish themselves, and one which I must think implies, when so employed, the same arrogant and invidious assumption with which the Romanists are charged for using the denomination of Catholics.

‘Not, however, that it is correct to speak of them as having no creed. The word indeed is not used; but in that pamphlet you sent me there is an enumeration of the fundamental articles of faith held by the writer and those he represents. I admit that it is very general and comprehensive, and reconcilable with great diversities of opinion as to the points it touches on; but the question is not whether the articles are more or less liberal and comprehensive, nor whether they are scriptural, nor whether they are well selected. What is to the present purpose is, that they are articles; and though no subscription to them is required, I presume that if any teacher in one of their congregations were to oppose avowedly all those articles, and maintain doctrines adverse to all the positions laid down in that pamphlet, he would be ejected, or his hearers would desert him. At least if this be not so—if the members of the “Christian denomination” are equally prepared and equally ready to hear the worship of Christ enjoined one Sunday and reprobated as idolatrous the next—to listen by turns to Unitarian doctrine, and Quakerism, and Irvingism, and Walkerism, &c.—then I cannot con-

ceive for what purpose those doctrinal statements were put forth in the pamphlet as unfavourable to the religious views of the society it describes.

‘But if—as one cannot but suppose—the congregations do look for some such conformity, then it is plain they have a creed, in everything but in name, as much as any other Christian community; how much soever their creed may be superior in rationality. And, though they may have in name no subscription, it is plain that, in point of fact, their teachers do, in the discourses they deliver, and their congregations in the worship they use, subscribe to that creed every day.

‘I have said more than you may think necessary on a point so obvious, because it is closely connected with another on which I think myself bound to explain to you—the impression several of your letters have made on me. I am not going to trouble you with any argumentative discussion of the theological or other questions; since, were I otherwise so disposed, you have declined entering on any questions respecting inferences, and desired me to confine myself to any objections I may have to make relative to matters of fact. But it occurs to me that you must consider yourself as having in several letters distinctly laid before me some of your views on the subjects of “orthodoxy,” subscription to “articles,” &c.; and that I have either acquiesced, more or less, in your opinions, or else on deliberate examination dissented from them. Now I think myself bound to let you know that neither of these is the case, and that I am most sincerely and unfeignedly unable to understand what your meaning was in the passages I allude to, and am totally in the dark as to your opinions of those points.

‘In one of your letters you speak with very high admiration of a sermon you had heard from a Unitarian

minister, the excellence of which you in a great measure attribute to his being free from the “weight of orthodoxy;” and you speak, on many other occasions, of the restraint which those labour under who belong to an “established church”—of the thralldom of “subscription to articles”—and of the painful trials of “beneficed clergymen of an endowed church,” who disbelieve or doubt the tenets of that church, and who are thus exposed to a struggle between interest and conscience, &c. Now there can be no doubt indeed that a man holding any preferment—or, indeed, any office, ecclesiastical or political—is exposed to a trial, and is tempted to stifle or to disguise his conviction when reasons occur to him for adopting opinions incompatible with the situation he holds. But the whole drift of your remarks seems to imply (otherwise indeed I cannot at all understand what their drift can be) that this is something peculiar to the ministers of an established church—or of an endowed church—or of a church whose ministers are required to subscribe certain articles, or a creed; or, at least, that the same remarks do not equally apply to Dissenters, or to Unitarian Dissenters.

‘And yet, on the other hand, I am no less at a loss to understand how you can have meant this. Dissenters must have, though they may not use the words “orthodoxy,” and “articles,” and “subscription,” something answering to these in everything but name. I cannot suppose (no one can) that a Methodist congregation, *e.g.*, would retain in his office a minister who should preach the Unitarian doctrine, or the Unitarians one who should preach Calvinism; or either of them a Swedenborgian, or a disciple of Joanna Southcote. They would say, “You are free to hold and to profess whatever opinions you please; but you are manifestly unfit to be a minister in our chapel if you teach doctrines at variance

with ours. We do not wish to force any man's conscience, any more than the members of any administration in expecting a resignation of office from one of their colleagues who thinks himself bound to oppose in Parliament one of their measures. You are free to worship God as your conscience dictates, and to publish to the world whatever you think ; but we pay a minister for expounding Scripture according to our views."

‘ A dissenting minister, accordingly, who should be in the receipt of a salary of £100 a year, which he must forfeit if he avowed a different religious persuasion from that of his congregation, would be exposed evidently to the very same struggle between conscience and interest—in the event of his entertaining doubts, either of the truth of Christianity altogether, or of that form of it which his congregation held—as a curate or rector of the Establishment with a salary or living of the same value. The trial, in fact, is one of those which no one in this world, in whatever situation, can be perfectly secure from. Endowments and subscriptions make no difference whatever. A man, suppose, has subscribed to the Articles of our Church ; he has a living ; he changes his opinions, and is conscientiously resolved to avow the change ; he is free to do so ; he has only to resign his living and withdraw from the Church. This sacrifice is no more of a penalty than the dissenting teacher must submit to who conscientiously resigns his chapel. Each may expect to be censured—perhaps reviled—by those whom he forsakes, and very likely applauded by those he joins ; but all this belongs to human nature, and has nothing to do with endowments or subscriptions. The only difference is, that, under the voluntary system, the congregation are the judges, both collectively and individually, how far their minister is qualified to retain his office ; whether they

designate such qualification by the term orthodox, or evangelical, or scriptural, or rational, or interesting, or by whatever term. Instead of Thirty-nine Articles he has to subscribe to the judgments of perhaps ten times thirty-nine hearers, who are competent not only to agree together to discard him, but each one of them to withhold, or diminish, or augment his contribution, according as he thinks of the preacher. There is a dissenting congregation in Ireland, who being displeased with their minister for countenancing the Education Board, agreed to mulct him of half his salary till he should withdraw that co-operation. In fact, all the advocates for the voluntary system that I have ever heard of, have been so far from pleading that it would give greater independence to a minister, that they have urged the very reverse—viz., the additional check that would thus be afforded on any minister who might be disposed to neglect or to abuse his office. And I myself should think this an advantage, but for two circumstances which distinguish this from other cases that fall under the general principles of Political Economy: 1st, men are competent to judge who are the best teachers of French, *e.g.*, or of mathematics; and 2ndly, the knowledge of such things may fairly be left to those who will and can afford to pay the best teachers. There is therefore no need to have endowed teachers of French or mathematics, unless, for any particular reason, it should be thought a national object to diffuse such knowledge among all classes. To which considerations may be added, that it is no disparagement to a teacher of such things to be considered as having solely his own interest in view, because his own interest would never lead him to teach them in a manner that might be easiest to his pupils but incorrect and against his own knowledge, whereas in the case of religious teachers all these things are reversed.

‘The poorest, and those who have in the outset but little care about religion, have as much need as any of religious instructors; and yet it is those whose pecuniary ability, combined with religious zeal, makes them the best paymasters, that are likely under the voluntary system to have the most influence in the appointment and support of a minister. And he is also exposed, however firm his motives may in fact be, to the suspicion, not only of professing a religious system which he does not sincerely hold (which suspicion applies equally to beneficed clergy of the Establishment), but also, besides this, of consulting the taste and wishes of his hearers in each particular sermon, in order to keep up contributions. But whatever may be the respective merits of the two systems, it is evident that the “weight of orthodoxy” cannot be taken off the mind of the preacher, except in name, under either. This, indeed, is so evident that I cannot bring myself to think you had overlooked it; nor again, on the other hand, can I at all understand what else you could have meant.

‘There is another point I do not clearly understand. You seemed, in one letter, to be speaking of endowments as not undesirable, supposing that not to be allowed to a particular system of faiths expressed in Articles and Liturgies. And yet I can hardly think you meant to recommend a system which, as far as I can understand it, must make these endowments such an apple of discord that it would be far better to confiscate them at once. Suppose a man appointed by a certain congregation, or by trustees empowered to elect on their behalf, to a living, on the strength of the general good opinion entertained of him by the electors. He perhaps preaches doctrines different from what was expected—perhaps different from what he himself had formerly taught,

and at variance with the tenets of a great part of his audience. They, or a portion of them, call upon him to resign, on the ground that the endowment is for the benefit of the people, not of the minister. He perhaps refuses, insisting that his tenets are not changed, or are changed for the better, and that they ought to follow him ; then the malcontents do not simply withdraw, as under the voluntary system, but apply to the Court of Chancery, of which there was not long since an instance ; and thus the endowments became a source of endless litigation and ill-blood in England, and in Ireland probably of downright war. I do not see how such a result could be avoided but by giving distinctly to certain persons a summary jurisdiction, the judgment of which persons would be in fact the Articles which the ministers would have to subscribe.

‘Excuse me, my dear friend, for having so long detained you beyond what I expected when I begun. I did not trouble you with any requisition of your opinion on these points : you gave it spontaneously. Nor do I now call on you to defend your opinions, or even to explain them. But being at a loss to determine—not whether they are right or wrong, but—what they are, and apprehending that you would conceive yourself to have laid before me an intelligible statement of your views, I thought myself bound to give my reasons—not for differing from you, for I really do not know whether I do or not, but for remaining in doubt as to your meaning.

‘Ever, my dear friend, yours most truly,

‘R. W.’

‘Redesdale : April 23, 1835.

‘My dear Friend,—I am sorry you should have had so much trouble in writing your preface, especially as I find myself compelled to point out to you that it is not

calculated, at least without considerable alterations (as I think you will perceive yourself on re-examination) to answer the purpose. However, there is no hurry on my part, that need call you off at present from your other avocations. I will only mention now the points that have most struck me, that you may consider of them when there is leisure.

‘ 1. You all along convey the impression that the necessity for leaving my house, &c. depends on my situation as Archbishop. Now, the case would be exactly the same were I a private clergyman, or even a layman. You could not, with any comfort to yourself even, have remained an inmate of a family of sincere and openly-avowed piety, who had family worship in which you could not conscientiously join, children whom they were educating in opposite religious principles, friends with whom they were used freely to converse on such topics, &c. &c. This calls for a very short and simple alteration.

‘ 2. The most important point of all is that every one will understand you to set me down as a Sabellian, and yourself as having tried, out of regard and respect for me, to persuade yourself into the same view, till you found that Sabellianism is only a flimsy veil for Unitarianism. I wonder this did not strike you; but I am sure it will, on a re-perusal—at least it will the general reader; and any one quite a stranger to you, and judging only from the work before him, would be apt to call it an artful and insidious attack. For, without saying in direct terms that I am a Sabellian, it is yet so implied, as not only to leave no doubt, but even to assume it, and allude to it as a matter quite familiar to both of us. I need not add, perhaps, that “Sabellian” is understood as a term of reproach even by those who understand nothing else about it. How far the views actually entertained by Sabellius

may have coincided with mine, no one can know with any certainty unless some works of his own are discovered; but the traditional idea of a Sabellian, originating in the acts of adversaries, are those speculations about "sun, light, and warmth," and again about "body, soul, and spirit," &c. which I disapprove neither less nor more than I do all other speculations, whether of ancient schoolmen or modern rationalists, in explanation of matters which, I think, would have been revealed to us in Scripture if we had been meant to have clear notions of them. I always endeavour to check myself in any such speculations, and to ascertain, as well as I can, what sense the Scriptures would convey to plain unlearned hearers of those days, without either adding in or pruning off from this, in order to make a more ingenious, or satisfactory, or rational system. And, as my disapprobation of all these systems, including, by name, the Sabellian, has been published by me ("Logic," p. 368), my character for ingenuousness, as well as orthodoxy, would be involved, if your preface should be published as it is.

‘ I am not, you are to observe, attributing it to you as any fault that your nerves are, as you observe in one of your letters to me, unequal to the fatigue and excitement of any such discussions—much less that you mean to impute any fault to me; for had you thought me to blame in those feelings which through misapprehension you impute to me, you would, of course (according to the excellent Gospel precept you lately referred to), have told your brother of your complaint against him "between him and thee alone;" you would certainly not have first mentioned it, if regarded by you as a fault, in a paper designed for publication. But the impression your language will convey to the general reader will imply what he will regard as a fault. The impression is, that I am

altogether, in respect of the points of difference between us, led by my feelings rather than my reason, and that I am sore and impatient of opposition on those topics, particularly where it is to be most suspected that I have a sort of half-consciousness of my tenets being unsound and incapable of standing the test of argument. All this those who know me best will, I think, altogether reject, from their own experience of me; with these, consequently, your explanation will be quite unsatisfactory.

‘Those, again, who do not know me, may believe the account to be a true one; but they will think it, especially as coming from an intimate friend, anything but a credit to me.

‘And I doubt whether, after all, it will be thought possible, that a person of so open and unreserved a character as yours should have been living with me, in such intimate terms, so long—they having heard me speak so often of the conversations we have held on religious subjects—without my at all suspecting all the time what your real religious principles were.

‘What then, you will say, is to be done in such a case? I can think of but one course, which I do most earnestly and deliberately recommend to you. Lay by the publication for the present season; and, when you bring it out, say nothing in the preface to, or of, me in the way of vindication, except a general declaration “that in your separation from the Church, and in the religious system you have thought it right to adopt, you differ altogether from some valued friends whose intimacy you had prized, and whose sincere piety and candour you acknowledge and respect.” This will, I think, after such an interval, when your residence with me is not quite so recently in everyone’s memory, be quite sufficient and much the best thing that could be said.

‘ I do not speak of this interval with any view of your opinions changing, or of the force of your arguments being impaired. Quite the contrary. However deliberate your conviction may in fact be (which is your concern), it cannot but appear more deliberate (which is all that concerns the reader) next year than now ; especially when I remember, as do so many others, how often, in detailing your own religious and intellectual life, you have remarked (and those who heard it from you have often, you may guess, repeated it to others), that when you took up the Unitarian views, you found your former objections to Christianity starting up afresh, and gaining new force ; but that, now, the doctrine of our Lord’s divinity was the rock on which you had anchored your soul, and which could alone secure you from infidelity : when I reflect on this—which, indeed, appears not much less strongly in print, in your “ Poor Man’s Preservative,”—I cannot but see a great advantage which your work would have, in respect of its immediate object, if you could add, that during the experience of at least one year since your decidedly quitting the Church, this anticipation had not been verified. I hope you will acquiesce in my suggestion ; as I do not think there is anything you can publish at present (anything at least that both you and I believe, and which the public are likely to believe), that would not do great detriment to my character.

‘ But should you not be satisfied with the suggestions I have given in this statement “ between me and thee alone,” then I entreat you to follow up that maxim to which you called my attention ; only, instead of my taking with me one or two witnesses, I leave you to choose any sensible friend, to judge whether my apprehensions are or are not reasonable. Take, for instance, our friend Senior, or M. Zulueta, or both of them ; show them what I have

said, and I will acquiesce in whatever they decide. We ought not to "tell it to the church," *i.e.* to lay the complaint before the public, except when a man shall have resisted both private remonstrance and the judgment of private friends.

‘I am glad to hear what you say of Crabbe; he is worthy of you, and you of him.

‘Ever yours most affectionately,

‘R. W.’

‘August 31, 1835.

‘My dear Friend,—Mrs. W. has answered your letter. I now send a parcel, which I made free to open to see whether it were worth sending at once. I see it is a book from Neander, and which I made out to be dedicated to you. Thank you for your book. I imagine that in the prevailing political excitement, few non-political publications will just at present excite much attention. Should it, some time hence, attract considerable notice, I think it likely that notice will be of a very different kind from what you seem to anticipate; of a kind much more painful to your private feelings, and for which, therefore, I think myself bound in friendship to prepare you, that you may fortify your mind against it. As for the theological question, it would be easier to say something plausible on either side of that, than to vindicate, satisfactorily to the public, your character for frankness and ingenuousness; of which, nevertheless, I myself, from my own knowledge of you, am as firmly convinced as ever.

‘It will probably be asked of me whether at the time when I was living with you on terms of the closest intimacy—consulting with you perpetually, and referring to you on religious questions, and encouraging my family to receive religious instruction from you—whether, at that time, I

was aware of, or suspected, your present notions, or believed you to profess your former ones, not from the full conviction of your reason, but through sympathetic feelings.

‘I shall, of course, answer that I not only had no ground for thinking this, or for suspecting that you were concealing from me anything that was passing in your mind; but, on the contrary, that you took every opportunity of expressing your disapprobation, both of the opinions, and even of the persons also, that you now approve. I remember in particular Mr. —— sending, about a year and a half ago, to me and to Dr. Dickinson a sermon or tract (I forget whether it is the same you now refer to), and that, on being consulted whether it would be worth while to take any notice of it, you pronounced, after inspection, that he was an empty conceited coxcomb, not deserving any attention.

‘And I must add, that I no more suspected your then professed sentiments to be adopted or assumed through sympathy with me and your other friends, against the deliberate conviction of your reason, than you now suspect your present sentiments to be influenced by sympathy with Mr. Armstrong, or any one else who has made meritorious sacrifices to conscientious conviction.

‘On this, or any other point, a man should incur no blame for changing his opinions, when he sees ground for it. But the perplexing circumstance is that you profess not to have changed, but to have held fundamentally the same opinions for many years. I cannot but wish you had been content to state simply, “My views *are* so-and-so;” as the public are only entitled to be told what a writer actually thinks. How long he may have thought so, or how he came to think so, is entirely a private concern; supposing he rests the defence of his views, not on his own personal authority, but on argument. As it is, I

expect to be asked what I have to say in behalf of your ingenuous openness of procedure.

‘As for my own disclaimer of all knowledge of your views, that will be credited by all who have even the ordinary share of candour; because I can refer them to your printed works, besides manuscripts (prayers, &c.), and many conversations remembered by several persons. But, then, I shall be asked whether I consider you to have been playing the hypocrite all this time—holding one language to one person and another to another, and, perhaps, dissembling more or less with all. For the private memoranda, they will say, in which you describe yourself as recording all that passed in your mind, must convict you of duplicity, if they are at variance with what you expressed to your friends, or to some of your friends.

‘I shall answer, that, notwithstanding any appearances, which to a stranger must be unfavourable, I most sincerely acquit you of such a charge, and firmly believe that, liable as you may be, in common with many others, to deceive yourself, you are incapable of wilfully deceiving your neighbour. And I shall add my own full persuasion that the habit of making private memoranda of our thoughts from time to time, so far from necessarily proving a help to the accuracy of the memory, may, if especial care be not taken to guard against the danger, tend even to mislead the memory; because it may occasion our forgetting more completely whatever we do not enter in the book; and we not only do not enter every thing we say or think, but are likely even to omit, in particular, whatever are, at the time of writing, our ordinary habitual thoughts and conversations, and to record chiefly what is striking, from its having newly occurred to us. Hence, there is a danger of our remembrance becoming, not like a book partially defaced and torn, in which we perceive

at least what deficiencies are to be allowed for, but more like a transcript from a decayed MS. which the ancient copyists by trade used to make; writing straight on all that they could make out, and omitting the rest without any mark of omission, for fear of spoiling the look of their copy.

‘Be this as it may, however, I shall bear testimony, as far as my own belief goes, from my knowledge of you and of all that pertains to you, that you are incapable of any intentional falsehood or dishonest concealment, and would say nothing that you did not at the time conscientiously believe.

“But if so” (I shall probably be told), “why should he publish, when he cannot be sure that he knows his own mind? Whether he was under a delusion and self-deceived for several years (as he seems to give us to understand), or only for some months past—which he represents as the belief of some of his friends—on either side of the alternative, he stultifies his own work, and proclaims himself unqualified to come forward as an instructor of the public. Whatever allowances may be due to the man—placed in perplexing circumstances, and severely tried by mental and bodily sufferings—whatever allowance is due to the man, does not extend to an author, who is bound to lay before his readers, if not absolute truth, at least what the author calls ‘his own truth’—his own perfect conviction; and this is just what, by his own showing, he is unable to ascertain. For what has happened may happen again, or may be taking place now. We have every reason to expect that next year, or next month, he will publish a book declaring that he not only is, but has been all along unconsciously, a Deist or an Atheist, a Quaker, a Swedenborgian, or a Papist, and that he has only just

met with some one who has removed the flimsy veil which had concealed his real views from himself. It may be a duty to publish to the world what he believes to have been his long-continued self-deception, but then he ought to publish nothing else, since he can neither give nor have any security that he is not equally self-deceived now. He says, indeed, that he is conscious of no delusion. To be sure not. Who ever was? But, at the time of his former publications, he did not give notice, nor of course feel, that he was then under any delusion. And judging of the future by the past, we ought not to be surprised if he should tell us a year hence that he never was a believer in Christianity at all, though he had persuaded himself that he was so."

'All this I cannot but fear will be said, if the publication should attract notice; and I can make no answer, except to persist in my protestations of belief in your sincerity and good intentions. But I have thought it best to lay this fully and honestly before you, painful though the subject is to both of us, because it is only anticipating a pain which you would be likely to feel the more severely if unexpected.

'I regret to see the "London Review" going on from bad to worse. There was an article in No. 1 which evinced considerable talent, though illiberal and malignant in the highest degree. But one in No. 2 does surprise me, because the reputed author I had supposed incapable of writing anything silly. The persecuting spirit of it I do not at all wonder at, having long since pointed out that that is nothing peculiar to religion, and may just as much be expected from atheists; but the idea of the clergy giving lectures on geology, mechanics, &c., and concluding with superintending moral dances, is really worthy of the very weakest religionist that ever wrote. Such

nonsense will do no harm, except to such truths as are inculcated by such writers or their associates.

‘Ever yours affectionately,

‘R. WHATELY.’

*To Blanco White.*

Redesdale : Sept. 7, 1835.

‘My dear Friend,—For such you will ever be to us, as long as it may be possible for us to contribute at all to your comfort, or at least lessen your discomfort—it is matter of regret that I should have been the means of vexing you beyond what I had expected, from your supposing (as you seem to do, though I had no idea of conveying that meaning) that the “future reviewer” I was personating was to be myself, or some one instigated by me. You could not otherwise have considered me as lost to you, merely on account of my differing from you (as you have often done from me) in some opinion, or even as to the judiciousness of some practical step, or giving you a friendly warning—whether wisely or not—of some attacks from others, which I thought might take you by surprise, and which it did not rest with me to prevent.

‘As far as my power does extend, I have, so far from meditating anything of the kind myself, done my best to prevent it. I may as well tell you now that it was not from mere conjecture of what seemed intrinsically probable that I was speaking ; I had received a letter from a person who, though not a clergyman, has given considerable attention to religious subjects, admires your writings, and is generally considered both intelligent and liberal, suggesting (after sundry remarks which I need not repeat) that I or some one else should answer your book.

‘I replied that, as to myself, if I ever did admit an exception to my general rule against engaging in contro-

versy, the last occasion on which I should do so would be with a personal friend.

‘In fact, nothing would induce me to publish in such a case, except a necessity (which I do not now see likely to arise) of vindicating my own character.

‘I added also my disapprobation generally of controversy, especially personal, about points that should be settled by argument and not by authority. But I could not be sure that what I said would convince that individual; or that, if it should, there might not be attacks from other quarters—attacks which I apprehended would be of a different kind from what you were prepared for. I expected, however, that an announcement of this apprehension would give you some pain, and I was aware that the bearer of unwelcome tidings is apt to be, to our first impressions, himself unwelcome. I felt therefore the same sort of reluctance to make the communication, that a parent is likely to feel in inoculating his child with a grievous disease, to save it from the probability of an attack much more severe coming on an unprepared frame.

‘It is not for me to say whether my resolution was a wise one. But of this I am sure, and so I think must you be, that we are the last persons in the world who would willingly give you a moment’s needless pain; or, again, who would shrink from even incurring some transient displeasure, when called on to take any step that we thought might save you eventually from a greater amount of suffering. I am sure you have no need to be reminded how long we laboured to promote your ease and happiness—not so successfully indeed as we could have wished, but as sedulously as if that had been the main object of our lives; and this, not merely when we were repaid by the benefit and pleasure of your conversation, but with even redoubled diligence when your health and

spirits were prostrated by illness. I am sure, you can never deliberately suspect such friends of any but the best and kindest intentions, whether the steps taken appear to you judicious or not. Nor do I think you will, on reflection, impute want of candour to those who were not prepared for your late declaration. I cannot but think, when you said in your last, that any one of candour who had read your works must have been prepared for that result, you must at the moment have forgotten the purport of pp. 14, 15, of the revised edition of the "Preservative," published last year, and also the still stronger tone of the MS. prayers—of which indeed you have probably kept no copies. But, be this as it may, we give you credit, and I trust you will always do as much by us, for uttering sincerely what are at the time your real impressions.

‘And now, having said, in my last letter and in this, all that I thought, perhaps mistakenly, I was bound in friendship to say on the subject, and all that I think there can ever be need to say, it will be best from this time to drop the subject of our differences of opinion, and to correspond as friends agreeing on many points—and in none more, I trust, than in mutual goodwill towards each other.

‘I send you a sermon delivered and published in behalf of a charity which I think highly deserving, not only of support here, but of extension to other places. The charity embraces people of all persuasions, and the sermon keeps clear of all points of controversy. Perhaps it might be well to send it to the patrons of some hospital in Liverpool.

‘Since I wrote last I have read some more (I cannot say all) of the first article in the second number of the "London Review." Pray read p. 282, and then the passage in Copleston which is referred to ; which it is plain the writer

must have had before him, while it is equally plain he trusts to his readers not having it before them. Every reader of the "Review" is led to suppose that it is on some point of religion or politics that Locke is censured for "relying on evidence," the whole question being, in fact, concerning the utility of boys' writing exercises—a question in which, as it is altogether one of opinion, all must admit that the judgment of experienced men, such as Quintilian, is an "evidence" (if that word is to be used in such a case) deserving of much attention. And this most impudent misrepresentation, brought in as the basis of the bitterest invective, is framed by a man who is not ashamed to talk in high-flown language about "truth!" All who have any notions of morality, whatever may be their religious views, must be disgusted with such baseness. One is not indeed responsible for everything that is said in all parts of a review to which one contributes; but I feel sure that if you could have calculated (I am sure I did not) on the writers indulging in a strain of such deliberate and malignant falsehood, you would have shunned them as if infected with the plague.

'Have you seen Lord Brougham's "Natural Theology," and Mr. Wallace's remarks on him? I had not expected much from anything I had heard of Mr. Wallace; but from what I have seen, he appears to be a much sounder philosopher than Lord B.

'I hope this letter may find you better than the last lid. I grieve that that should have arrived just when you had been shattered by a recent attack. But that I could not foresee. That it may please God to smooth your path through the remainder of this life, as much as His wisdom may see good for you, and after this life to bring you to His eternal rest, is the fervent and daily prayer of your sincere friend,

'R. WHATELY.'

## CHAPTER IX.

1835.

Visits Tunbridge Wells—Letter to Mr. Senior on Tithes and Church Property—On Public Pledges—Letter to Marquis of Wellesley on Church matters—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Lord Melbourne on National Education—Letters to Mr. Senior, &c. on Church and State questions—Report of a conversation with the Archbishop on various subjects—Letter to Mr. Senior on the Tithes Bill—Letter to Lord Melbourne on Tithes—Letter to Mr. Carlisle on the Sabbath question—Letter to a friend.

THE year 1835, which had begun so sorrowfully, was spent by the Archbishop in his usual indefatigable labours in his diocese, combined with an amount of literary activity which to many would appear incompatible with diligence in any other department. It was varied by a summer visit to his friends at Tunbridge Wells, in which his family, as usual, accompanied him. Tunbridge Wells is, indeed, a place almost identified with recollections of him. He was always partial to the place, and his relatives there look back with mournful pleasure to those early visits. The long rambles which, in such days, he delighted to take in the beautiful country around, especially in the Bayham Woods, are associated with his memory; and one lofty spreading tree, 'The Monarch of the Woods,' though not an oak but a sycamore, stands conspicuous for miles round, where his brother-in-law, the only survivor of the party, recollects their taking shelter from a snowstorm in May, with their friends, the Rev. Henry Bishop and Mr. Nassau Senior—all now passed away.

Another recollection of his sojournings at Tunbridge Wells is connected with his visits to the Chapel Free School, where, with his characteristic love of teaching, he would delight the boys with questions, as they pleased him with their ready and intelligent answers; and on such occasions would indulge them, at parting, with some riddle or arithmetical puzzle, which they long remembered. But this is a digression.

The question of Tithes and of Church Property at this time was much occupying the public mind. How the Archbishop viewed the subject will be seen in some of the letters of this year:—

‘ Dublin: January 24, 1835.

‘ My dear Senior,—I have received a very civil answer from Sir Robert Peel, saying that he attaches great importance to your subject of Secondary Punishments, and will soon turn his attention to it.

‘ We have had also a favourable answer, though not in the most manly style, to the Education Board application to the Lord-Lieutenant<sup>1</sup> as to the designs of Ministers. The answer was merely a demand of our estimate for the expenses of the ensuing year, which, as it would be nugatory if they did not mean the system to continue, *implies* a design to continue it; but it would have been more open and honest to *say* so plainly.

‘ By what I can learn, the “measures-not-men” party, or “fair trial”-ites, seems to gain ground, the principle of it being, I conceive, that the King may nowadays please himself as to Ministers, since it is no longer they but the Reformed Parliament that governs the country. A minister will no longer go out as soon as he fails to carry any measure, but will act the part of a cook at an hotel, who

<sup>1</sup> Lord Haddington, under Sir R. Peel, succeeded Lord Wellesley in Jan., 1835: was succeeded by Lord Mulgrave in April.

proposes a dinner, but offers to send up any dishes the company like better. If this state of things be established, it will be the greatest practical result of a Reformed Parliament. One consequence will be, that men of the highest character will no longer take office. A minister used to be a stage-coachman, who drove at a certain fixed hour, and a settled road, those who chose to go by his coach ; now he will be a gentleman's coachman, who drives when and where his master bids him. They will only accept office for private pay and patronage. One evil resulting will be, no one responsible, unless a law is passed to make every M.P. responsible individually for every motion he makes. Another will be a sort of unsteady yawning course of the state-ship ; Mr. Ward will carry a measure to-night, and Sir Robert Peel another a week after, and Lord Stanley a different one afterwards ; so that our Legislature will be a more motley "picnic" than ever.'

*From the Rev. C. Dickinson to Mr. Senior.*

‘ January 30, 1835.

‘ My dear Sir,—The Archbishop, in a walk to-day, started some points which appeared to me of so much importance, and so worthy of a place in your pamphlet, that I urged him instantly to suggest them to you. Unfortunately, he has just now so many letters to write, that he could not do so in sufficient time, probably ; he has, therefore, proposed to me to write to you ; and though I shall fail in giving them the life which he can diffuse, yet I shall transmit to you the skeleton, which you can resuscitate.

‘ The “measures-not-men” party have much that is plausible at first sight ; and at present they have put themselves forward, or are likely to do so, in a manner calculated to attract approbation. But, on consideration, it may be shown that this system involves the most

complete democracy. Those electors who demand pledges upon any question, and vote in consequence, belong to this party. Instead of selecting the individual to whose discretion it seems best to intrust the interests of the country, they resolve on the measures, and support those who promise to maintain them. Those members are not responsible, for they are bound by their constituents; at least their constituents can never upbraid them.

‘But what method can be adopted to stop the pernicious system of requiring pledges? This should be stopped by the firmness and honesty of candidates; but it is vain to rely on these qualities. The Archbishop proposes that a member should lose his vote and right of speaking on any point when he is known to have given a pledge. After this he is not free to deliberate; he is no longer, on this point, to be regarded as a member of a *deliberative* body, and should forfeit his right of acting. I think you might work up both these points advantageously.

‘Believe me, yours sincerely,

‘CHARLES DICKINSON.’

*To the Marquis of Wellesley.*

‘Dublin: Jan. 30, 1835.

‘My dear Lord,—It is needless, I trust, for me to express how highly honoured I feel by the approbation and confidence of one who has had, and has known how to use, such extensive opportunities of observing mankind. I will only say that, as the official connection between your lordship<sup>1</sup> and the Archbishop of Dublin is, for the present, at an end, I feel the more flattered by the circumstance of my being consulted in my individual capacity.

‘I had seen and slightly glanced over the sketch of a projected Church reform, as it appeared in the papers;

<sup>1</sup> As Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.

but it is not sufficiently definite to enable me to pronounce decidedly upon it. Various different measures, none of them at variance with anything that is thus said, might be proposed—some judicious and complete, some imperfect and unsatisfactory, and some pernicious.

‘I will avail myself of your lordship’s indulgence to lay before you, though in a less regular form than I could wish if leisure permitted, the main principles which I think ought to be kept in view in any measures relating to the Church ; but I must first—as the husbandman clears a field of stumps and bushes before he ploughs it—dispose of some of the most prevalent fallacies which form an obstacle to our arriving at just conclusions.

‘1st. The radical and semi-radical papers and speakers abound with fallacious declamations about the “working clergy,” the “poor curates,” the justice of “proportioning the income to the labour,” &c., &c. Now I wish, with all my heart, I had a million per annum to bestow in increasing poor livings and curates’ salaries ; and as it is, I should gladly see, in a few instances, small livings augmented at the expense of certain rich ones. But to proceed thoroughly on the principle above laid down, and distribute the present revenues of the Church among the officiating ministers in proportion to the work done, would be about as wise as to pursue a like plan in respect of the officers of the army. *Verbum sapienti*. But many are accustomed to talk as if curates, rectors, and bishops were three distinct species of men. I was ordained about nine years before I obtained any benefice or even permanent curacy ; the next nine years I was incumbent of a living on which (alone) no one could live in the most frugal style of a gentleman. Bishoprics, indeed, and other great preferments, are few ; but, besides that a few great prizes in a lottery tempt many to take tickets, there is an

advantage in them over and above the hope (entertained by many more than eventually obtain anything great) of possible high preferment. A dignity is thus given to the whole of a profession. Many a lawyer, or naval or military officer, of good family and education, will even, without ulterior prospects, undertake toilsome offices for a remuneration less than is enjoyed by your butler, because theirs are the professions of *gentlemen*, being those of judges, admirals, and generals. This consideration is even independent of the benefit of the bestowal of preferment as a reward for meritorious services—a benefit never to be lost sight of. In the Church of the Vaudois—as far as I can learn, one of the purest and best-conducted that exist—poor parishes, in rugged mountainous districts, where the pastor has to encounter severe fatigue, are assigned to the younger clergy; and from these, vacancies are filled up in the richer (or rather less poor) parishes, where the toil is less, and the duties consequently more suited to a pastor in advanced life. “Shame!” would our radicals exclaim; “the harder the work the less the income!” But the Vaudois are quite right.

‘2nd. Pluralities are liable to much abuse, but are not necessarily themselves an abuse; and if (with our present revenue) they were swept away, I doubt whether we should be the better off. *E.g.*, the vicarage of Wicklow is a union, having in it three churches. I heartily wish they were endowed with 500*l.* per annum each; but as there is but that for the whole, I put in Mr. Chamley (whom your lordship knows), a man of experience and steadiness, to serve there by himself, and curates, junior men, who may be superintended by him, and hereafter advanced, should they prove deserving. Now, query, would it have been better to divide this 500*l.* equally among three young men (for Mr. C. would not have

accepted one share), each fixed permanently as a poor vicar on 130*l.*, instead of temporarily as a curate at 75*l.*? This is a type of many cases.

‘Moreover, in each rural deanery, not containing any one good living in my gift, I should be glad to present an experienced and able man as rural dean, with two or three adjoining ones, to enable him to keep curates, so as to enable him, when needful, to be absent, even on Sunday, to visit neighbouring churches as rural dean, *i.e.* as deputy bishop.

‘3rd. Non-residence is a topic of most fallacious clamour. *E.g.*, I know a clergyman who has worn out his health in the labours of his parish, and has been lately made the victim of factious misrepresentation, as a non-resident, living in a house a stone’s-throw out of the parish, but nearer to the church by a mile than many houses within the parish. I always endeavour to enforce residence, but not with the vain expectation (often entertained in respect of absentee landlords also) that the advantage accruing from a voluntary residence of one who resides, because he is conscientiously zealous, can be obtained from compulsory residence of the body where there is no mind to reside. I rather hope to deter by a penalty such men from accepting livings in which they do not like to reside.

‘4th. It is a great error to calculate the total labours of the clergy, and still more of the bishops, from the total number of Protestants. If you could collect all the Protestants of Ireland into one district, one bishop and a proportionate number of clergy, and a proportionate endowment, would suffice; and so, in many parts of Ireland, where there are twenty shops, one would be enough, if it were within reach of all the population. As it is, I have rather the most trouble with those parts of my

diocese in which there is a small and scattered Protestant population.

‘5th. The above fallacy, and much of the clamour against the sinecure Church of Ireland (whose revenues I really believe are not superfluous), has partly arisen from a fallacy of the opposite side. The claims of the Establishment have generally been rested by its advocates, not on the wants of the people, but on the truth of our doctrines. They are just as true in India as here, yet all would see the absurdity of a wealthy endowment for them in India; and by resorting to so untenable a plan, we raise a presumption that we have none better.

‘6th. It is a prevailing notion with many of all parties that the temporalities of the Church are alone to be attended to by the Legislature—at least till all questions relative to that branch are completely settled. “Don’t mix up questions of Ecclesiastical Reform, such as those about the Liturgy, Church Government, &c.; with questions of temporalities,” is the language of many who, I believe, if the truth were known, would afterwards put off all the purely ecclesiastical questions till the 30th of February. Now, to pass over many other (in my mind) weighty reasons, for considering the two classes of questions in conjunction, I will only put such a case as this:—We are inquiring, suppose, into the funds of some hospital—whether they require to be aided by government grants or a county rate; whether, on the contrary, part of the estates may fairly be alienated to other purposes; whether the property might be more advantageously managed, &c. Is it, in such a case, wholly a matter of indifference, and irrelevant to the inquiry, whether the hospital receives various sorts of cases, or only one description; is open to a small district, or admits patients from all; in short, how it is available, or might be made more

so, for the beneficial purposes of a hospital? The application is obvious; unless, indeed, it be assumed, that to suppose the Established Church could be made, by any (not injurious) alterations, acceptable to some who are now Dissenters, would be a supposition too absurd to be worth a thought. If it be possible or conceivable that the terms of communion could safely be so modified as to embrace a larger portion of the nation, it is evident that an attempt to do this is not only to be recommended as in itself desirable, but is closely connected with questions concerning the endowments of what is called the national Church. To make it so strictly national as to comprehend all individuals of the nation (which was its original design), it would be vain to hope, without infringing on religious liberty; but the guardians of all endowments and of all property, viz. the Legislature, are bound to inquire how near an approach they can make towards this point, while they are inquiring concerning national endowments.

‘Dean Swift says, “What matters it how wide you make the door, as long as there are men who take a pride and a pleasure in not coming in?” I answer, 1st, that even in respect of these, it is important to show that the fault is theirs, not yours; and, 2nd, that you cannot say, at least till you have tried, how many there may be that would come in. *E.g.*, a clergyman remarked t’other day, that he had in his parish above 800 Presbyterians, who had no hostility to the Establishment, many of them often coming to church; and that most of them would join it altogether if it were not for the absolute requisition of sponsors for baptisms.

‘I should therefore recommend, as one of the first steps, the appointment of a Commission to inquire into the ecclesiastical condition of the Church, and to recommend such immediate alterations, and such a form of permanent

ecclesiastical government by members of the Church, as may appear proper. I fear the step is too bold to be adopted; but what safety has been or can be incurred by temporizing timid half-measures? The Radicals are for overthrowing the Establishment—the ultra-Tories for maintaining everything as nearly as possible just as it is. If the third party waver from side to side between the two, or sit still because it requires boldness to take a decisive step, they will not only incur deserved contempt from both, but will be guilty of the timid rashness of a horse in a stable on fire, which resolutely stands still to be burned.

‘7th. Temporalities. 1st. Commute tithes on some such plan as sketched out in my “Evidence.” Mr. Blake had, I find, struck out a similar one twelve years ago. The coincidence, on such a point, between us is a strong presumption in favour of the plan.

‘He, I find, would have placed the management of the funds entirely in the hands of the clergy. I objected, that the endowments ought to be under the control of both lay and clerical members of the Establishment, because they belong not to clergy alone, but to the people. “The Education Board,” I remarked to him (and he admitted the justness of the parallel), “grants a salary to a school-master, not for his benefit, but for that of the scholars.” And it is the same with university professorships, &c. 2nd. Cathedral endowments to be as much as possible brought to what I believe was their original design—places of education for the candidates for Orders after leaving college.<sup>1</sup> On this point your lordship knows my views; and it is remarkable that they coincide with those long (professedly) entertained by the very person who chiefly opposed my plan, with no objection (avowed) but the site, which he would have had under the walls of

<sup>1</sup> See Professor Pusey ‘On Cathedrals.’

Trinity College—a change which any one as well acquainted with colleges as I am would see must be most mischievous. And yet, though he was on the bench before the greater part of his present clergy were even at school, he has allowed one generation of them after another to go on without that professional training, either on his plan or mine, which he admits to be so important. 3rd. Equalisation (or nearly so) of bishoprics, so as to put a check on translations, would, I think, be on the whole good; but the ecclesiastical government of the Church should be empowered to appoint suffragans or sub-bishops (*chorepiscopi*) in each diocese, to exercise all episcopal functions, each in his own department, under the control of the bishop. These would need no fresh endowment, only the best benefices in the bishop's gift; and they should not be lords. This would give much greater efficiency to the existing bishops, and would be a good training for the office. 4th. Social helps might be given, at little or no cost to government, which would be a great assistance to the clergy—viz., exemption of all glebe-houses and lands in the United Empire from all taxes and county-rates for ever while *bonâ fide* occupied by the incumbent; removal of the heavy and inconvenient burden of stamp-duties on indentures; exemption from postage of all letters from or to a bishop on purely ecclesiastical matters (to be stamped in print on the covers) within his own diocese, to or from his own clergy and churchwardens. The revenue would lose nothing, as the pastoral circulars which would be sent, letters of inquiry, &c., &c., to the immense increase of a bishop's efficiency, are now either not sent, or sent by coaches.

‘ Glebe-lands in Ireland, charged with exorbitant rents for ever, should be purchased on a valuation, and moderate interest paid on the advance.

‘Also money might be advanced (on moderate interest), secured on livings, to be repaid by instalments, for building moderate glebe-houses, where residence is prevented by the want. Glebe-houses are much more essential than churches.’

‘Saturday, 1835.

‘My dear Senior,—I want you to write a short account of Malthus’ views, which perhaps might be subjoined to a few lines of memoir of his (I believe not eventful) life. I wish justice to be done him—1st, against his enemies ; 2nd, much more against his professed friends, who have made him a tool for noxious purposes. On looking over his book (1st edition) t’other day, I was struck with perceiving how much obloquy and misapprehension he might have avoided by a different choice of words. When he speaks of war and pestilence as “necessary” to keep population within the bounds of subsistence (where the preventive check does not operate), the better word would have been “unavoidable,” and the word “tendency” should have been explained as in my Ninth Lecture.

‘I am corresponding with Lord Melbourne about the Baring Clauses,<sup>1</sup> &c., and find him well disposed.

‘I like what I have seen of Lord Morpeth. I exhibited to him and Lord Lansdowne an examination at the National School in Political Economy, which struck them as admirable.’

‘Dublin: May 4, 1835.

‘My Lord,<sup>2</sup>—As a member, and I trust no inactive member, of the Education Board, to which your lordship lately addressed a letter, I take the liberty of submitting to you some remarks in reference to the subject of that communication. I speak only as an individual, but the

<sup>1</sup> Clauses introduced this year by Mr. Bingham Baring into the Irish Church Bill, but negatived. See the following letter.

<sup>2</sup> Apparently to Lord Melbourne.

only two members of the Board (one not a member of the Church), with whom I have as yet communicated on the subject now before me, agree in the main with my views.

‘There is much alarm felt among many Protestants in Ireland, not men of extreme party views, but liberal and moderate, as to the intentions of Government in reference to the Established Church, and the National Education Board. The course of procedure which is apprehended is in fact not merely from formal documents, but in part also from the reports of speeches made in the House, and from what appear reasonable conjectures as to the designs of the speakers.

‘It is concluded, first, that in parishes where there is a very small or no Protestant population, the revenues of the Church will be either wholly or in part, as the case may be, transferred to the Education Board, as the incumbents drop, their life-interests being reserved; secondly, that in the event of an increase in the Protestant population, such portion of the funds thus alienated, as may be thought requisite, shall be drawn from the Education Board and restored to the original purpose; thirdly, that in the event of a further diminution of the Protestants, a further portion shall be withdrawn from the Church, and applied to the purpose of general education. This last supposition is merely conjectural, but is so strictly the converse of the preceding that every one at once concludes, and must conclude by parity of reasoning, that it must be contemplated. Now, it will not be supposed, by any one who knows much of the state of Ireland, that we contemplate as probable any such increase of the Protestant population as to call for the restoration of a considerable portion of the alienated funds. In a few places, perhaps, attempts may be made, I fear with disastrous results, by some zealous Protestant landlords, to increase, with this view, the pro-

portion of Protestants on their estates ; but on the whole we neither hope nor fear any such result. What alarms us, is the holding out the principle of such a system as the apportioning of the revenues of the Church and of the Education Board to the varying proportions of the Roman Catholic population to the Protestant ; and again, the principle of making the funds for national education contingent upon the death of incumbents. The natural effect of the latter of these provisions must be to place the clergy so circumstanced in a most invidious and, in this country, a most dangerous situation. No one who knows anything of Ireland would like to reside here surrounded by his heirs, on whom his income was to devolve at his death. And such would be very much the case with an incumbent who was regarded as standing between the nation and the national benefit—viz., of provision for the education of their children. Then, in respect of the other point, every Protestant who might come to settle, or remain settled in any parish, would be regarded as tending towards the withdrawing or withholding, as the case might be, of the funds of the national education, and diverting them to the use of an heretical establishment.

‘The most harassing persecutions, the most ferocious outrages, the most systematic murders, would in consequence be increased fourfold. Bitter as religious animosities have hitherto been in this wretched country, it would be to most persons astonishing that they could be so much augmented as I have no doubt they would be by this fatal experiment. When, instead of mere vague jealousy, revenge, and party spirit, to prompt to crime and violence, there was also held out a distinct pecuniary national benefit in the extermination of Protestants, it would be in fact a price set on their heads, or they would be hunted down like wolves. I need not assure your lordship of my

conviction that nothing can be further from your wishes than such results. I give proof of this conviction even by making this statement, which would point out, to any one who did entertain such a wish, the most effectual mode of keeping Ireland in a state of perpetual agitation.

‘The arrangement I have been alluding to seems on the face of it, and in itself, as equitable as any that could be devised; but in order for it to work well, it would be requisite that, in a regard for justice, in candour and liberality of sentiment, and in peaceable and orderly disposition, the mass of the Irish population should be as much superior as I fear they are inferior to the most civilized people on earth.

‘I beg to assure your lordship that I am not one of those who deny that the endowments of the Church are to be considered as national property, and who would invest them with a sort of sacred inviolability, based, not on the wants of the population, but on the truth of the tenets of our Church. I acknowledge that much of this kind of argument has been adduced by supporters of our Establishment, and to this cause I trace, in some measure, the excessive degree in which the wants of the Protestant population, as compared with the Church property, have been underrated. The position assumed was one which had no reference to those wants, for our religion must be as true in Hindostan as it is here; and if our Hindoo dominions were divided into parishes, with an endowment for a clergyman in each, every one would be forced to allow that to be a sincere Establishment. And if, instead of 700,000, the number of the Establishment in Ireland were but 70, the truth of the religion would remain the same, though manifestly its equitable claims to endowments would be very different.

‘But I will add, that I am now speaking, not as a clergy-

man, or even as a member of the Church, but as a member of the civil community, in reference merely to the promotion of public tranquillity, which would be most awfully disturbed by making the Church endowments an apple of discord between those of different persuasions. Better, far better, would it be to confiscate at once and for ever all the endowments held by the clergy, and leave them to be supported by voluntary contribution, or by manual labour. However impoverished, they and their congregations would at least have security for their lives.

‘But the evils I so much deprecate may, I feel no doubt, be avoided, not only without abandoning the advantages sought for, but even in such a manner as to secure an increased benefit. I would suggest that it should be determined at once, and finally, what amount of revenue should be left to the Protestant Establishment, and that Government should take possession of the surplus, whatever it might be, as a reimbursement for all that has been already, or shall be hereafter, expended in grants towards national education in the British Empire. Let the existing incumbents of such benefices as it might be determined to suppress become at once life-pensioners of Government, and let whatever grants might seem advisable be made *at once* to the Education Board, or any such institution, instead of letting the Irish nation understand that a great national advantage must be postponed in great measure till the death of certain Protestant clergymen, and that after all it is to be on a more or less liberal scale, according to the less or greater number of Protestants. I can foresee one objection that may be plausibly urged against what I propose. If, it may be said, there is to be a final settlement, without any eventual restoration or further diminution, how are we to meet the possible alterations hereafter in the numbers of Protestants?

The revenues which are fixed on as now sufficient, may hereafter become either inadequate or excessive. Now, I would observe, that an alteration of numbers, even far greater than I can at all anticipate, would not destroy the propriety of such an adjustment as might now be fixed on. I suppose, for instance, a parish in which there are now one hundred and fifty Protestants, for whose benefit a minister is maintained; should the number be hereafter trebled, he could very well attend to four hundred and fifty; should it, on the contrary, be reduced to a third, it would not be unreasonable that even fifty Protestants should not be left without any minister; and if they are to have one at all, there must be a decent maintenance for an educated man. And should any parishes eventually lose the whole of their Protestant population, I can state, from my own knowledge as a member of the Ecclesiastical Board, that there are many, very many, places where the revenues of such parishes might be most advantageously bestowed in building glebe-houses and augmenting wretchedly poor livings. If, on the other hand, an increased Protestant population should hereafter spring up in several places, I can state, also from my own knowledge, that several instances of the kind have occurred and are occurring in my own and in other dioceses; in which cases endeavours have been used, with more or less success, and are now going on, to provide places of worship and endowments by private liberality. At any rate, whatever difficulties of this we may hereafter have to encounter, I should say, let us struggle with them as we can, or be aided by a direct and specific government grant, without the least hint being dropped about the restoration of alienated Church funds which had been appropriated to national education; or, again, of a further alienation for the promotion of any Irish national object.

The faintest surmise of anything of the kind would be fatal to all hopes of tranquillity. I am indeed inclined to believe that hints or declarations of such intentions on the part of Government as I am deprecating, would, for that very reason, be welcome and encouraged by some whose credit and whose interest are involved in the maintenance of perpetual agitation in Ireland. But an enlightened statesman, who sincerely seeks to promote peace, will not consider as a presumption against the expediency of any plan, that it is not so acceptable to those whose trade is to promote turbulence. To seek to pacify Ireland by compliance and favour shown to its disturbers, would be even worse than the superstitious procedure of our forefathers, with their weapon-salve, who left the wound to itself, and applied their unguents to the sword which had inflicted it.

‘I have trespassed much on your lordship’s time and patience, but however erroneous, or however superfluous, may be any part of what I have urged, I trust to be pardoned in consideration of my motive ; which is, if I know myself at all, the same by which I believe your lordship to be actuated—a sincere anxiety for the public welfare. No other motive indeed would have overcome my reluctance to exchange a life far more suitable to my own tastes and habits, for the situation I now fill. And the same motive induced me to encounter all the harassing disquiet and toil, and to have all the obloquy, consequent on the part I have taken as a member of the Education Commission. From that arduous post I have never flinched for one moment, though of course occupying the most exposed and invidious point of it. And I am willing to persevere, provided, and only provided, the Board is not to be supported by a fund that is to fluctuate and vary according to the longer or shorter lives of Protestant incumbents, or the diminution or increase of the

Protestant population. But I cannot consent, and I have felt myself bound to make this declaration early, to become in any degree a party to a system that would tend to keep up and foster the religious animosities of this distracted country.

‘I think it right to add that, in the report of a speech of Sir Robert Peel, I observed that some of the topics of this letter were touched on; but not till after I had communicated my views on the subject to some who are now members of Administration.

‘I have the honour to be, &c., &c.,

‘R. DUBLIN.’

The following playful effusion, beginning a letter to Mr. Senior on Church and State questions, is very characteristic. The Secretary was his loved and valued friend Dr. Dickinson, to whom the letter was dictated:—

‘May 28, 1835.

‘My dear Senior,—Don’t be afraid of my communicating to you through my secretary, for he is such an ass he does not perceive at this moment that I am writing to you about him.

‘I enclose you a letter from Lord Duncannon and my answer.

‘I went to the Lord-Lieutenant yesterday by appointment, and had a long conversation with him about the Irish Church. I have sent him to-day copies of my letters to Lord Lansdowne and Lord John Russell; also your pamphlet in strict confidence. I think I succeeded in exciting in his mind a sense of danger which he did not previously feel. He seemed to contemplate two measures distinctly—first, a tithe-bill, and second, a congregational system. I urged him not to divide a bitter potion into two doses, but to get all down at once at one gulp. I

pointed out to him that measures themselves are the only warrant of finality—that, say what you will, you cannot bind your successors.

‘Yours truly,

‘R. WHATELY.’

‘(*Private.*)’<sup>1</sup>

‘Dublin: May 28, 1835.

‘My Lord,—I shall make no apology for replying to your lordship’s favour received yesterday, briefly, uncere-  
moniously, and freely.

‘The proposed clause, though not incompatible with such an arrangement as would obviate the apprehended danger, does not in itself at all go to meet the difficulties. The questions which will be asked upon it are, “To what fund will the revenue of the suppressed benefice go? And from what will the restored revenue come?” If the answer be, “The National School in the parish, or the National Education Board, or some Irish national object,” the reply will be that the provision in the clause is vain, and worse than vain. It is vain, because in such a country as this the fifty Protestants would not dare to sign the paper; and worse than vain, because if there were forty-five in the parish there would be a desperate combination to prevent by all possible means the increase of their numbers.

‘The difficulties to be encountered are these: the resolution implying that the supposed surplus of Church revenue is to be appropriated to national education, it will be understood that the funds for national education will be increased or diminished according to, first, the death or life of existing incumbents; secondly, the diminution or increase of Protestants; and this is in fact, in a country so lawless, so agitated, and so reckless of bloodshed, to set a price on the head of every Protestant.

<sup>1</sup> Probably to Lord Duncannon.

‘ I grant that it is in itself, and supposing a peaceful and fair-minded population, a very equitable arrangement ; but what is wholesome food to a man in health, may be poison to a man in a fever. We administer a draught of water to clear away anything that is choking one. In hydrophobia, water chokes. But all this, unhappily, some English members do not understand, and some Irish understand it too well, and will earnestly recommend such a course, precisely because they know that it will keep up a perpetual smouldering civil war. I am convinced that many of those English members, who would with the greatest difficulty be persuaded to abandon an arrangement which seems in itself both just and tending to the allaying of animosity, will be as much grieved as surprised when they see the result of a tenfold bitterness of animosity and restless agitation.

‘ Add to this that the Education Board itself will become an object of far more bitter hatred and opposition than ever before, whereas it is now rapidly gaining ground in the goodwill of Protestants. Mr. Blake, who will not be suspected of Protestant prejudice, declared to me spontaneously his resolution to withdraw from the Board if any of the revenue of the Protestant Establishment should be directly transferred to it. He said he could not bear to be put in an invidious and indelicate situation for the sake of carrying on a system whose efficiency he was convinced would be ruined, while interminable agitation and dissension through Ireland would be the result. I of course must adopt a similar course, even if he did not, but I believe all the most efficient members of the Board would also withdraw.

‘ I am fully aware of the present difficult position of Government. They must not appear to stultify the resolution of the House of Commons ; nor, again, must

they, unless they would totally and finally ruin Ireland, allow even the appearance or suspicion of putting the Protestant Establishment and National Education in the two opposite scales.

‘No feeble timorous half-measures will avail in a case of such extreme difficulty and peril; nor do I think it would be desirable to divide the measures proposed, when there is at any rate so much odium and opposition to be encountered. It would be preparing two struggles instead of one.

‘If I might be allowed to suggest in such a case the course which seems to me to lead to, I will not say the best, but the only outlet, I should say, let it be fixed what amount of revenues it is thought fair to leave to the Protestant establishment; then, after it has been settled, in what mode the composition, &c., should be collected. Let the endowments be made over to the Ecclesiastical Board, for the support of so many bishops at so much, so many rectors and curates at so much, so much for repairs of churches and glebe-houses; the whole together not to exceed so much, and the overplus to be paid over to the consolidated fund in part compensation for all that Government has advanced, and will hereafter advance, for the support of education. Thirdly, the revenues retained by the Board to be divided to the several ministers according to the wants of the Protestant people, without reference to the territorial divisions of parishes. Fourthly, all the incumbents at present holding sinecures to be at once made pensioners on the consolidated fund.

‘This sounds a very sweeping measure; but what that is not a sweeping measure could have done more at any rate than patch up matters in Ireland for a very few years, even if the late resolution of the House of Commons had not been passed? And as things now stand, the most difficult and odious parts of such a plan must be encountered.

And if a painful and perilous operation must be undergone, it is folly not to amputate all the mortified part at once, and leave another amputation to be undergone hereafter.

‘In point of expense, I would remark that hardly any one seriously believes the expected surplus will be anything of great importance in itself. The chief thing complained of is the sort of insult implied by the spectacle of an endowed clergyman whose flock are not of his persuasion. All the expenses that may be incurred by providing liberally for national education, and for the real wants of the Protestants ; all that, in short, can be incurred by doing all that money possibly can do for the pacification of Ireland, would not be a fourth of what was cheerfully incurred for the chance of pacification of the Sugar Islands. If, then, we should calculate very closely the difference of 100,000*l.*, more or less, in this case, we should resemble a man who should be much alarmed, and readily submit to any medicine or regimen for the gout in his foot ; but when it attacked his stomach, think much of any inconvenience necessary for a cure.’

The following extract is from a letter written to a friend, and giving the report of a conversation between the Archbishop and a clergyman, on the subject of this friend’s views and opinions :—

‘Mr. — began by expressing his regret that you had withdrawn from the party you had long been connected with. I could not, I said, participate in that regret, it being always my advice to every one to keep clear of the shackles of every party.

‘He said he conceived me to be prejudiced against the party in question, on account of the very unjustifiable treatment I had received from some particular members of it.

‘I strongly protested against the charge of “*préjudice*”

in the strict sense, viz., as a pre-judicium, a judgment formed antecedently to knowledge. Having lived so many years, in various situations, in the midst of men of various parties, personally intimate with many individuals of each, aloof from all parties as parties, and a watchful bystander, it was imputing to me the most perverse blindness to say that I judged not by evidence but by prejudice.

‘He said he did not mean in the strict sense, but only that the ill-conduct of some members of the party made me think more unfavourably of others.’

‘I dislike all parties, as parties; but as for the individuals comprising them, I make great allowance for a party-man’s acting in a way that would be execrable if he were unshackled. Having enlisted, and marching in the ranks of a party, his conduct, when urged on him by his associates, is though not excused, yet palliated, and is entitled to some degree of pity (not unmixed with contempt), if it be such as he would, if left to himself, abhor. But then, on the other hand, he is in a great degree responsible for all that is done by the rest of his party, in the cause and in the matters wherein they are associated, even when he has no personal share. He is affording them his countenance—“comforting, aiding, and abetting.”

‘Mr. —— said that you were of a disposition to need and wish for the support of a party, and could not well do without it.

‘I replied, that though some may be more inclined than others to join a party, I had advised you, as I do all persons, to keep clear of all; and that, holding as I do that this is the duty of all, I could not doubt that it was possible, though more difficult for some than for others.

‘He said he had felt convinced that he could effect some highly important objects much better by enrolling himself

in a party than by standing single ; and that he had therefore done so, though he disapproved of much that was done by his party.

‘ I said it was perfectly justifiable and right to join with any person, or any party or association, when distinctly understood to be for some specified definite object or objects ; but not to enrol yourself as a supporter, indefinitely and generally, of all the views and practices of those whom you do not throughout approve of. It is quite right, for instance, to join in some charitable association with men of various religious and political sentiments ; the nature and objects of the association being distinctly stated, you are pledged to nothing else ; the members are not pledged to each other’s religious or political creeds ; they are responsible each for himself alone, in all matters not pertaining to that particular charity. So also, if I join with certain Members of Parliament to oppose or to forward some specific legislative measure, I am not responsible for the rest of their public any more than of their private conduct. So also, as on education committees, I act with Roman Catholics and Dissenters on a specified plan, for a definite object. But if I allow myself to be reckoned as one of the High Church or of the Low Church party, or any other such party as is characterised not by aiming at some one or more specified measure, but by the general tendency of their religious principles and views, everything which comes before the world (in reference to those principles), and which I do not distinctly and publicly disavow, becomes to a certain degree my act. Though not distinctly done by me, the agents derive from me (as well as from each of the other individuals of the party) some of that countenance and support which I in return receive from them, in furthering such measures as I seek to promote.

‘In fact, this is proved by the very reason Mr. —— assigned for acting with a party, viz., the support and countenance of a party enabled him to accomplish the better what he reckoned desirable objects. Now it would be absurd and indeed unfair to think of obtaining, himself, this aid towards his own views from others, if they were to derive none from him towards theirs. Now this makes you, said I, responsible to a certain degree for much that you admit to be most unjustifiable conduct. Are you not therefore even more to be blamed (instead of being thereby excused) in consequence of the disapprobation you feel of that which you nevertheless so far sanction ?

‘No doubt one may, as a member of a party, effect many good objects more fully than he could otherwise. So he might by turning Roman Catholic, or Mahometan, or Hindoo : he might convey some good moral lessons, and check some faults among those who could not otherwise be brought to listen to him ; but would he be justified in becoming, on that ground, a member of a church or sect which he believed taught much that is false and sanctions much that is vicious ? This is clearly a case of doing evil that good may come. And it clearly makes no difference in principle whether the error be one or another ; whether greater or smaller ; whether there be two or three or fifty errors thus sanctioned.

‘If you have no right, for the sake of effecting some good object, to become a Mahometan, you have no right to become a member of an orthodox or an evangelical party, if they inculcate or practise, as a party, anything you disapprove ; unless you distinctly and publicly protest against any such act or tenet of theirs.

‘By-the-bye, it is curious to observe how Mr. —— and other members of his and of other parties are themselves actually doing the very thing for which they censure,

without any real foundation, the education committees. You hear much clamour about our combining with Roman Catholics—compromising principles, and all that ; and I am made accountable for Romish theology, and for all the Roman Catholic errors ; as Archbishop Murray is, by “ John Tuam,” for all that I have written against Romish errors ; as if we were members of a party ; for all which there is no ground whatever, because we are acting together solely for a specified object—the diffusion of a certain kind and degree of instruction to the poor, and on a system of which the rules are all written and printed and published. It is just so that the members of the Dublin Mendicity Institution are acting together for the relief of a certain class of poor ; and thus the Irish landlords, Whig and Tory, are uniting to concert means of altering a certain portion of the Poor Law Bill.

‘ If, indeed, the object of the Education Board be a bad one—if it be better that the poor Roman Catholics should be left totally ignorant unless they will consent to be educated as Protestants—on that ground let us be censured ; but it is mere folly, or something worse, to represent us as responsible for each other’s acts and tenets, as individuals : we are responsible only for what is regularly resolved on and ordered by the Board. But it would be otherwise if, like the very persons who censure us, we allowed ourselves to be considered as members of a party, formed not merely for certain specified and definite objects in particular, but for the advancement, generally, of certain religious views and practices ; and if we allowed, without protesting against them, certain views to be promulgated, and practices recommended, and measures adopted, by members of that party, and understood as coming from the party, while we secretly disapproved of them. This is what we do not do, but what those persons do, who at

the same time impute to us the very faults they are guilty of.

‘They think, forsooth, they can effect, as members of a party, some good which they could not otherwise. I think that as an Education Commissioner I can effect good objects which would otherwise be unattainable; but that consideration would not justify me if I purchased this advantage by giving my sanction to something which I thought wrong or erroneous. And why am I not giving any sanction to some error, for instance, of Dr. Murray? Not because I tell you or Mr. —, in a private conversation, that I disapprove of some of Dr. Murray’s views; but because I am not one of the same party with him—not combined with him at all, except in the specified work of carrying into effect a certain distinct plan, drawn out by Lord Stanley for a precise object.

‘But to return to my narrative. Mr. — said it was very well for such a person as myself to resolve to stand aloof from all parties—that I was able and worthy to stand single, &c., but that for more humble individuals like him, it would be too presumptuous, &c.

‘I said, I had not been thought much of early in life, but that I had very early formed the resolution to tie myself to no man or party, but to listen to reason from every quarter—to “prove all things, and to hold fast that which is right,” according to the best judgment I was able to form. And this plan I laid down for myself, not because I thought myself an eminent man, but because I thought it a Christian duty. I have faults enough of my own to answer for; I can’t afford to answer for other people’s. And yet that I must do, if I act at the bidding of others, or if I give my implied sanction to the acts of a party. It is in vain for me to throw off my free agency; I cannot throw off my responsibility. Whether the light

of reason that God has given me be strong or weak, He does not authorize me to shut my eyes, and be led blindfold by any human party or rabbi.

‘Accordingly, I never did, said I, even when I was a person of no note or expectation, enrol myself as a partisan; and what is more, I added, if I had I should now have been a party-leader.

‘It was not, I said, from disdaining to occupy an inferior place in the ranks of a party that I kept aloof; but from objecting to party, especially religious party, as contrary to the words and spirit of the Apostle’s admonitions. When he censures as “carnal” those who said, “I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of Christ,” he does not make any exception in favour of some humbler class of Christians; he does not say, “You that are great and eminent men ought not to be carnal, but ordinary Christians may;” nor again, when he says, “Are ye not carnal and walk as men?” he does not say that such conduct is carnal in some persons, and not in others; but he censures and forbids parties in the Corinthian Church generally. I must conclude therefore, said I, that he meant to extend this to all Christians (till I see some reason given for an exception), and not merely to great and eminent men. It may be said, to be sure, that there is something of moral greatness of character in resolving not to follow a leader, and to show due respect indeed and kindness to all men, but to “call no man master upon earth.”

‘“Ay,” said he, “that is just what I mean when I speak of a great man being such a one as can and should keep clear of party; it is not so much intellectual as moral greatness that is wanted for acting such a part.”

‘True, I replied; but it is precisely this moral greatness that is required of every Christian, and which he is

enabled to manifest. If this be a duty (as Paul distinctly declares it to be), it must be something possible. What is the Gospel given for? What mean the promises of Divine grace? Is the Christian religion not designed to elevate our nature? And if so, and intellectual capacity or superhuman knowledge are not to be looked for by all Christians, what is the elevation of our nature to consist in, if it be not that moral greatness, which you speak of as being a thing not to be thought of by one in a thousand? Are the rest, the mass of Christians, to claim, by virtue of their being God's people, the privilege of being allowed to continue "carnal"? Are these to show their humility, not by submitting to God, but by submitting to a party of men?

“Be not deceived: God is not thus mocked.”

‘ June 2, 1835.

‘ My dear Senior,—I send you an account enclosed of what I wish to have effected, if possible, by a clause in the Tithe Bill.

‘ On the whole, I have considerable doubts whether the Tithe Bill can be carried by such a majority in the House of Commons as will enable them to force it through the other House, unless some provision be added which may plainly indicate a desire to benefit the Protestant Church. And such a provision would be, I think, what my most rancorous opponents now publicly admit to be the wisest and best provision—what I suggested three-and-a-half years ago—to throw the Church property, whatever it may be thought right to leave us, into the hands of an Ecclesiastical Board. The Church has been spoken of as if it were a body-corporate, and could distribute its revenues as might seem best on a joint deliberation; while, in fact,

there being no such power of self-government in any matter, either ecclesiastical or civil, we have been unjustly blamed for excessive sinecure (or nearly sinecure) endowments, while other portions of the Establishment have been inadequately supplied. And thus a local congestion has been mistaken for a general plethora. Suppose the army was maintained by separate endowments for each regiment and for each fort, not to be otherwise distributed, many of them would in time become superfluous; and yet the whole military establishment might be short of what was needed.

‘Whatever is taken from us, let us at all events be allowed to make the most of what is left, by being allowed to apportion it rationally. This would be a benefit to the Church; but it would be no less so to the proposers of the measure, because they would thus get rid of the odium of the name of “abolishing Protestant parishes,” “leaving Protestants destitute of spiritual aid,” &c., &c. Let a board of our own have the regulation of the funds, and you may trust them not to throw away money by locating several ministers where one or two (circulating perhaps from one small congregation to another) would suffice.

‘Unless some such course be taken, you should remember that the party now in power are placed between two others, one of them, if not each, stronger than itself, and rather desirous of driving matters to extremity. Many, at least, of the Radicals would not dislike to see the Tories reseated, in the confidence of being able to drive out both them, and, with them, several of our existing institutions and principles; and many again, I know, of the Tories trust so much to “reaction,” that they would not be sorry to see the Radicals in place, on the principle that an overdose of poison may be rejected by the stomach, and so save the patient. It is a very difficult game that the

middle party have to play, and their best chance, I think, is to fortify themselves by the support of these honest *bonâ-fide* friends of the Protestant Establishment, who are not mere political Protestants.

‘As for these last, I regard them and the Radicals as only two different kinds of enemies to the Protestant Church ; they are like the Asiatic and African hunters of the elephant ; the latter wish to kill the animal for his ivory and as much flesh as they can carry off, leaving the rest of the carcase as a scramble for hyenas and vultures ; the others wish to catch and keep him for a drudge.

‘I am convinced it would be much more popular, more convenient, and more equitable, to decide in the first instance what shall be left for the support of such a number of bishops or ministers, and of churches, as shall be deemed requisite, and then to proceed to consider what shall be done with any eventual surplus. This supposed surplus having been monstrously overrated (except on the supposition of the disendowment of livings being carried to a monstrous extent ; for four hundred at 250*l.* each, which is above the average, must be totally stripped to make 100,000*l.*), would of itself produce perhaps no worse effect than a ridiculous disappointment as to the objects to be effected by a surplus that will never accrue ; for you might as well legislate as to whose perquisite are to be the larks that are to be caught when the skies fall. But in practice, much positive evil may be caused by the designed and hypothetical appropriation of a nonexistent surplus. If, for instance, the perpetuity fund (which is for the benefit of the Church) is to receive any eventual excess of the suppression fund above what the Education Board may need to repay its debts, then the Church and the Board are placed in opposite scales, in the very way I deprecate ; for though I do not believe any such excess

is likely to accrue, the very proposal of such a scheme would make it the interest of Protestants, as such, to try to check the progress of the Education Board, in order to diminish its expenditure, and thus increase the amount allotted to Protestant purposes; and, again, the efforts of Roman Catholics to extend the education system would, not unnaturally, be attributed to hostility to Protestantism, as much as to zeal for education; and the hostile collision and animosity now existing may thus be doubled, by a rivalry in the pursuit of what, after all, is probably but a shadow. And those (probably the majority of all parties) who should perceive that it is but a shadow, would be disgusted by the appearance of disingenuous shuffle and mystification. Those who really wish to see Ministers disgracefully defeated, would inwardly rejoice to see a provision inserted which could so well be made a handle of.

‘I am sure, as I have said, that it is no more than necessary, in this emergency, to conciliate the real friends of the Church, as far as can be done without decidedly contravening the principles distinctly recognised by the great majority of the House of Commons; but in defiance of those who are in reality like malicious furies, seeking to lead Ministers into difficulties, and then leaving them in the lurch, vanishing like an ignis-fatuus.

‘Now, such a measure would be the just and popular one of meeting the present difficulties of the Ecclesiastical Board (perpetuity fund), in respect of the building and repairing of churches, by advancing from the consolidated fund, without interest, as much as is really and fairly needed, subject to any kind of superintendence and control that you think right. *E.g.*, the diocese of Dublin alone (no unfair specimen), besides its calls for building and enlarging churches and chapels-of-ease to a very

considerable amount, which the Board has been obliged to waive altogether for the present—besides this, has estimates for necessary repairs of existing churches—what would have been defrayed by Church-cess—to the amount of 18,000*l.*, to meet which we have been only able to allot 7,000*l.*! Now, think how galling it must be to Protestants, both ministers and people—besides the many cases in which their church is too small, or none, or a glebe-house wanting—to see their Church falling into incurable decay month after month, while the Board is waiting for the death of bishops or purchase of perpetuities, and while the House of Commons is deliberating how to dispose of the superfluous wealth of the Establishment! The loan should be without interest, but to be repaid to the consolidated fund whenever the perpetuity fund should become greater than needed for such purposes.

‘Some other little grains of sugar might be inserted to render the dose palatable to Protestants, as far as could be done without offending Roman Catholics. For instance, it would be, *per se*, desirable to enact—and for the above reason most especially desirable to insert in this bill—the remission of all stamp-duties on indentures, which are a galling burden, and afford no adequate revenue; and also to abolish the necessity of applying to the Privy Council for removal of sites of churches, altering divisions of parishes, &c., which are troublesome, offensive, and vexatious, and now inconsistent, since the Ecclesiastical Board evidently ought now to have the regulation of all such matters.

‘I have mentioned the step I have taken relative to the building designed for the Theological College, not because I should like to have anything relative *eo nomine* to it inserted in the bill, which would do harm; but that if

possible it should be so worded as to facilitate, or at least not impede, hereafter the introduction of such a measure.'

*Copy of a Letter from the Archbishop of Dublin to  
Lord Melbourne.*

‘(Private.)

‘ October 24, 1835.

‘ My dear Lord,—I shall not send this letter for a day or two, but I prefer committing to paper at once what occurs to me, in answer to your lordship’s, just received.

‘ I have given much attention to the subject you advert to—the dependence and non-dependence of ministers on their parishioners. I will not undertake a wider discussion of the question than the case immediately before us calls for. Whatever may be the case in respect of parishioners of one’s own communion, it must be allowed to be undesirable that a Protestant clergyman should be dependent on Roman Catholics (as must be the case in most parts of Ireland, if he is to be at all dependent on his parishioners), since these would be probably led by their priest, as experience has often shown, to like him the better the more he neglected his duty. This one consideration is so decisive that I feel there is no need of dwelling on others of more general application; such as, that pecuniary connection tends to lead the person to attend to and conciliate chiefly the paying part of his parishioners, to the neglect of those who are both the most numerous and the most in need of his services.

‘ I might add my own decided conviction, from reflection and experience, that as this temptation does operate (under the existing system) on the worst and lowest-minded persons so as to produce an evil result, so, on the best again and most conscientious, though those who

would endeavour to do their duty under any system, their motives are liable to be misinterpreted under the existing one ; they are open to the suspicion, though a false one, of having tithes in view rather than duty, and thus their deserved influence is weakened. Those, again, of an intermediate character—neither wholly devoted to their pecuniary interests, nor quite exempt from the intrusion of inferior motives into their ministerial conduct,—these I have always found more likely to assume an air of stately independence in order to avoid all imputation of courting their parishioners from interested views. You may often see such a man kind and condescending towards those of his parishioners from whom he can look for no pecuniary advantage, while he is stiff and haughty towards those by whom he may be a gainer or loser. On the whole, I should say that making the clergy independent, in a pecuniary view (dependent for a pleasant neighbourhood they must always be), of their congregations (*i.e.*, of all their parishioners, as they now are of most), would be a great benefit in respect of the two latter classes of clergymen—the best and the second-best ; and in respect of the worst would do no evil, since it would only change one kind of fault for another, and not a worse—servile timidity or noxious flattery for insolence or negligence. But the circumstance I first mentioned is so decisive, as far as Ireland is concerned, that I need not dwell further on more general reasons.

‘As for the other two objections, as it is unnecessary to prove to your lordship that they are futile, so it is not, I think, difficult to meet them in a manner satisfactory to all who may urge them with sincerity, and are open to conviction ; the rest may be perhaps silenced, though never satisfied.

‘1st. The clergy, from being stipendiaries of their

parishioners, who are mostly hostile to their religion, will become stipendiaries of an Ecclesiastical Board consisting of respectable individuals belonging to their communion. If any one can deliberately prefer the former, he must have been reading of Romulus and Remus suckled by a wolf, till he has come to the conclusion that a wolf is the very best wet-nurse.

‘As for separating the clergy from the land, I have really nothing to say, but that it is not fields but human beings on which our culture is bestowed. I remarked before the Lords’ Committee, five-and-a-half years ago, how lamentable it was that under the tithe system, as buildings rise up and cover what were cornfields, the revenues of the clergyman are regularly diminishing, exactly in the ratio that the services required of him increase.

‘2nd. The principle of conferring a benefit on each spot, in consideration of the revenue drawn from the inhabitants of that spot, leads to such a long tissue of absurdities, and some of them so palpable, that I think those of the widest swallows would choke at some of them. 1st. All absentee landlords must be compelled to reside, and if they have several estates, to divide their expenditure among them. 2nd. A rich grazing district, producing a large revenue to the tithe-owner, but having a very small population, must have twice as much instruction bestowed upon it as a poorer district, in tillage, with perhaps ten times the population. 3rd. The bishoprics whose see-lands are (as is the case in several instances) in other dioceses, must have those lands transferred to bishops who, perhaps, want them less, in order, forsooth, that episcopal revenue and episcopal superintendence should locally be united. 4th. The poorer classes, or those of the wealthier whose property lies out of the parish, are to have no claim to the services of the minister, because they are not paying for

it; and if a man whose estates are in Cork or Meath is residing in Dublin, and needs the services of a minister, he must send one hundred miles for one. 5th. The tenants of the estates of Trinity College are to have their sons admitted to all the fellowships and scholarships, &c.

‘The fact is, the tithes are not in the strict sense paid by any one; they are no part of the property of the land-owner or of the tenant, which he parts with in exchange for services done to him, any more than the lands with which any hospital is endowed; they are the property of the nation, and they are an endowment bestowed to secure the performance of a certain service, which not only ought not to be, but never was designed to be, confined to the persons through whose hands the tithes pass. The poorest labourers have, and always had, as much right to the service of the incumbent as the richest farmer or squire; and it is nothing to the actual tithe-payer whether the poor, the great majority of those whom the minister attends to, live in the same parish or in another.

‘It is the same as if any one having an estate chooses to endow a hospital with it, and the tenants insist that none but they ought to be admitted into the hospital; to which they might add, with equally good reason (as has been done by many of the tithe-payers), that if they preferred another hospital, or had no need of any, they ought to be excused paying rent.

‘It is highly desirable that the proposed change with respect to ministers’ money should take place; for it is, by-the-bye, a mistake which I cannot account for to say that it is “not as yet openly resisted.” It is, and has been for above two years, most openly and notoriously resisted, to such an extent that (to take one instance as a specimen) the best, or nearly the best, living in Dublin has, in two-and-a-half years that the present incumbent has held it,

barely covered expenses. And most of the rest are in a like condition, or worse.

‘I would suggest, however, a small alteration, great in its beneficial results, and, I think, quite unobjectionable. It is placing a minister in a very unpleasant predicament to make the continuance of a tax on his neighbour depend on his life. Now, this might easily be avoided by fixing a certain definite time at which the payment should cease absolutely, and Government should secure the stipend to the ministers on the principle of a life-annuity, *i.e.* by calculating the average chances. *E.g.*, the number of incumbents now living who may be expected to be alive ten years hence is ———, the average value of their lives is ——— years. Add these ——— years to the ten, and let that be the time fixed for the universal ceasing of the tax. On this plan the total amount of ministers’ money would be neither greater nor less; but the inequality would be avoided, and the odium of a tax to cease on the death of a certain individual would be obviated: this is most important.

‘I fully approve of the total abolition, which I apprehend is contemplated, of the system which leaves incumbents as corporations sole to manage their own property, consisting of payments from their parishioners. I am glad also that it is proposed to adopt what has been called the redistributive or congregational system—viz., that of proportioning the revenues in future in some degree to the amount of the congregations, and not merely to the physical extent of territory. So far, therefore, I am far from objecting to the fluctuation from time to time in the value of each single benefice, so long as the total amount of the church revenues is kept free from fluctuation—from any such fluctuation, I mean, as depends not on good or bad harvests, &c., but on the proportion to the total number of Protestants to Roman Catholics in Ireland.

‘But if it be provided that “a surplus (p. 2) shall arise on the death of existing incumbents, and that surplus is to be greater or less (and of course the remaining revenue of the Church less or greater in all) according as Protestants diminish or increase, or remain stationary, such surplus to be applied to any public institutions in Ireland,” I feel convinced that nothing could possibly have a greater tendency not only to keep up, but to augment, all the animosity and jealousy that has ever existed between the parties.

‘I have before now spoken very strongly and fully on this point in several letters, but am still in fear of not being sufficiently understood, because I know there are so many in England, worthy and intelligent men, but ignorant of the state of Ireland—which is such, that the application they would make here of a principle abstractedly just would lead to unspeakable discord and misery. Now, such persons are likely to suppose that I am stickling for ten or twenty per cent., more or less—when it is the peace of Ireland I am looking to. If the revenues of the Church seem too great (I know that, whatever I may think, it is the Legislature that must decide the question), take what surplus you think fair—take more than is fair; but take it in the lump, once for all, so as not to make the remnant a continual bone of contention. And this it will be, if a surplus for national Irish purposes is to arise on the death of each incumbent, and is to be greater or less, according to the diminution of the numbers of the Protestants. If this is done, the disposition already too prevalent in each party to drive out the other, by whatever means, will be increased tenfold; each will have an interest, the one in diverting, the other in preserving from diversion, the revenues of the Church.

‘Above all, the National Schools will, I hope, not be mentioned or alluded to in this bill. The mention of

them in the last, and the discussion which ensued, revived much suspicion and hostility, which had begun to die away. Still more hurt will be done by again introducing the mention of them in a church bill ; and should it pass in that form, not only all the benefit will be stopped which has begun to be effected, especially in the conciliation of the two parties; but the system will become a perfect demon of discord. I have already in former letters expressed my views, and those of the other Commissioners, on this point so fully, that I need not go over the argument again. But I will merely add, that since, as I understand, the National School funds are not really to fluctuate with the greater or less revenue preserved to the Church, and the greater or less number of Protestants, there seems no reason for introducing any mention of the schools into a church-bill, except to indicate (what will inevitably be understood) that some ulterior measures may be expected hereafter—except, in short, as a vacant niche to be hereafter filled. Out of the consolidated fund which is to be the recipient of the church surplus, we are to receive 50,000*l.* a year—neither less should that surplus fall short, nor more should it exceed that same. Why then, it may be asked, should National Schools and Church be brought into the same bill at all, if the schools are to go on precisely as if there had been nothing enacted at all respecting the Church? The general answer that will be given by both parties will be, that the next Parliament, if not this—another Ministry, if not the same—will augment or diminish the funds of the Board according to the surplus arising from the Church. That this suspicion will arise and prevail, and that its prevalence, whether well or ill-founded, will convert the benefits that have arisen and may be expected from the schools into a poison, is the opinion of all the Commissioners.

‘And where can men be found better qualified, in point of information at least, in respect of this question, and less likely to be biassed by any one prejudice that can be common to all of us? We differ in country, in education, in religion, in profession, in station; it is surely not likely we should agree in any one error.

‘I earnestly hope, therefore, that the clause for the provision to be made for the schools will be put into some other bill, or brought forward as a separate bill.

‘In deprecating the fluctuation from year to year of the church revenues according to the variation in the number of Protestants, and wishing that whatever defalcation may be made should be once for all, so that the bill may be, not in name only but in its nature, a final measure, I speak merely as an individual wishing for the peace and welfare of Ireland. On the other point I speak as an Education Commissioner also, and as one who have shown that I do not shrink from labour or from obloquy, nor am alarmed at imaginary dangers.

‘The settling from time to time of the boundaries of parishes, *i.e.* the sphere of pastoral duties—the most important feature, perhaps, in what has been called the congregational system—is of course a work which may be done either well or ruinously ill, according to the machinery employed. And on this may hinge the whole difference of a good or a bad bill.’<sup>1</sup>

The letter which follows, to Mr. Carlisle, the Presbyterian Commissioner of the Education Board, on the ‘Sabbath’

<sup>1</sup> The Irish Tithe question was one of the chief battlefields of parties in 1834 and 1835. A Whig measure was introduced in the first year, a Tory in the second, neither of which passed. Their details are therefore unimportant now, except as eliciting the opinions of the Archbishop on the questions of moment which they involved.

question, needs no special explanation. The views given in it are the same as the writer has set forth in other works; but although this might seem an argument against their repetition here, it has been thought, on the other hand, that a letter which sets forth clearly and fully his whole mind on subjects which much occupied it, ought not to be withheld in a biography which has for its object to show him as he was. Of course his manner of viewing these subjects will not appear equally satisfactory to all; but those who agree and those who differ will alike be ready to bear testimony to his clearness of expression, and uncompromising boldness and straightforwardness in stating his mind:—

‘Neither I nor, I believe, any one else, ever denied the moral obligation of positive precepts, or supposed that the ceremonial law was set aside because it was ceremonial (else it could never have been binding); but that it was capable of being set aside, which a moral law is not. Hobbes, indeed, and others have placed all duty on the ground of positive enactment; but this, it is plain, would make it idle to speak of the moral attributes of the Deity.

‘A man of your acuteness, or the half of it, could not, in candidly examining this plea of necessity, fail to perceive that it would not stand good. I should not notice it, but for the sake of pointing out the immense danger of calling in the aid, to serve some present turn, of an unsound principle. It is like raising an evil spirit which we cannot afterwards lay. Incalculable mischief may result from teaching your hearers to use “the tyrant’s plea, necessity;” it is indeed the highwayman’s plea, the plea which may be used to break a gap in the hedge of all morality. (See “Logic,” Appendix, “Necessity.”)

‘Observe now what this necessity was.<sup>1</sup> The bed was in danger of being stolen, in broad daylight, from a public place, on the Sabbath, when the thief would have attracted notice (as the owner did) by carrying a burden ; a smaller risk can hardly be imagined. But if the owner feared it, he would have had to remain near the spot to watch his property till “the going out of the Sabbath,” viz. sunset, which he must have done at any rate if he had not been cured ; and at sunset we may suppose his friends would have come and carried him home, bed and all. To avoid the inconvenience of waiting there till then, “walking and leaping and praising God,” instead of lying a cripple on the same spot, till the same time, constituted the supposed necessity.

‘Now how many a hardworking mechanic with a large family might urge a much stronger plea of necessity for working at his trade on Sundays ! The extra shilling or two thus earned might provide better food for his children, or, if saved up from week to week, might pay the difference of a better lodging, or set him up in a superior set of tools, &c., or buy him a bed. And a like necessity might be, and often is, urged in defence of dishonest acts, &c.

‘Oh ! beware, my Christian fellow-labourer, how you encourage your hearers to learn this too-easy lesson, and to tamper with their conscience by referring to such an example as that of the lame man’s supposed plea of necessity ! (See Essay V., on the “Abolition of the Law,” in which this objection is met ; and see also Essay I., on the “Love of Truth,” section 4.)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Alluding to the history of the impotent man cured by Our Lord (John v.), and desired by Him to carry his bed on the Sabbath-day.

<sup>2</sup> The reference is to the second series of Archbishop Whately’s essays—that on ‘Some of the Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul.’

‘It makes all the difference whether you inquire, first, “on what grounds does such-and-such an opinion rest?” and afterwards, “what consequences are likely to flow from it?” or whether you reverse this order. The unbelieving Jews did the latter: “If we let Him thus alone, the Romans will come, and take away both our place and our nation.” Had they begun by candidly examining His pretensions to a divine mission, they would have received Him, though with as much perplexity about the course He was pursuing as, in fact, the disciples themselves did meet with. But they afterwards understood that the apprehended consequences of receiving Him did not follow; and that, in fact, when the Romans did come and take away their place and nation, it was the result of the rejection of the true and the preference of false Christs of an opposite character.

‘This is a plain proof that the Jewish Sabbath was at that time observed by the Jews, which no one ever denied. If “Pray that your flight be not on the Sabbath,” had had reference to the sanctity attached by Christians to their supposed new Sabbath, it would have been “Pray that your flight be neither on the first day of the week nor on the last;” for the Sabbath of their unbelieving brethren, and also their own, would have been exposed to inconvenience.

‘It is remarkable that in these precepts given to the Gentile converts (*i.e.* those, I apprehend, who had before been devout Gentiles), of such observances as were judged necessary to avoid giving offence to the Jews, such as abstinence from blood, &c., the Sabbath is not mentioned; though one might have conjectured that labouring on that day would have been even more offensive to the Jews than the use of unclean food. But I find from the Mishna that the Jews not only did not re-

quire, but apparently did not wish, the Gentiles living among them to keep the Sabbath as a day of rest. They found, it seems, a convenience in having some around them who were not so bound—as, *e.g.* in case a fire broke out.

‘The importance of one small particle—the argument here combated appears to be this: “The Fourth Commandment is abrogated, and we are bound to observe it without any change.” This I admit is stark nonsense; and yet it differs only by a single word from the argument I used, and which is only the more proved irrefragable by every fresh attempt to escape it; for “and” read “or,” and you have a dilemma which cannot be eluded by tying the horns of it together.

‘I really know of nothing in Scripture that might not be explained away in this manner by an ingenious man. What had the Gentiles to fear from the temporal penalties inflicted by the Jews on violations of the Sabbath? Or how could these penalties be called “a shadow of things to come,” of which “the body is Christ;” or how could Paul have laid such a snare for his readers as to omit saying, “I mean Sabbath-years; I am not speaking of Sabbath-days”?

‘I know that one great objection in the mind of many Christians to the admission of my views, arises from their reluctance to admit any power to belong to a church, even in respect of festival days, modes of worship, and other things intrinsically indifferent (in thoughts). But I cannot think them “exemplary” in these notions. They will obey nothing, forsooth, but the command of Scripture; but they obey these according to what each “conceives” to be the “spirit of the command,” and the permanent, not the temporary portion of it (as the Quakers profess to retain the sacraments “in the spirit” of them), all

which is in fact to obey, each man, whatever he likes or fancies.

‘This formidable consequence may be dispelled as soon as the ingenious but shadowy subtlety (as I think you must perceive it to be on the second glance, if not on the first) on which it is made to rest. Paul is manifestly speaking of the ordinances of the Mosaic law, which were “a shadow of things to come.” The question about Christian ordinances, and whether any church has or has not a right to establish any, was quite foreign from the whole discussion he was engaged in. You may see this by the context generally, and also by the use of the word “Sabbath,” which is never (account for it as you may) applied in Scripture to the Lord’s-day—indeed, hardly ever by any Christian writer whatever for fifteen centuries. It is plain that if Christians are “not to forsake the assembling together” for divine worship, the houses, places, and modes of worship (as well as the day) must be determined by some authority, for “God is not the author of confusion.”

‘I have bestowed, my dear Sir, as you see, close attention on your remarks; and it is no disparagement to you, but the reverse, when I say that their tendency has been to confirm my previous conviction. You have shown yourself, as I had anticipated, the most acute of all who have taken that side, and I think you have made the very best of it; and I cannot bring myself to doubt that if any man of common intelligence can bring himself to read and weigh carefully my tract, and those strictures on it, with an unbiassed resolution to decide according to the evidence, he must conclude that the Fourth Commandment can at the utmost be only called binding on Christians in the same sense as the law of the Passover, for instance, which corresponds to, and is in spirit fulfilled

by, the Eucharist—or as Circumcision answers to Baptism. For, supposing him to think that a probable case is made out, this (which is more than I could admit) amounts to nothing at all. Human legislators, indeed, do sometimes perform their work so clumsily, that a man is left in doubt till he consults able lawyers (and sometimes even then) what the laws forbid or enjoin. But far be it from us to impute such a defect to a divine legislator, in the case of a supposed law which is to bind each plain Christian every week—which yet is nowhere expressly declared—and the very mention of which was a startling novelty a little more than two hundred years ago.

‘A probable law, whose very probability is to be established by a tissue of ingenious arguments of acute theologians, is an idea which drives us into the Romish notion of the Scriptures being a dead letter to the mass of mankind without a living infallible interpreter. Indeed, a probable law emanating from divine wisdom seems to me so complete a contradiction, that any one who can admit it must be beyond the reach of any arguments I can think of. The only difficulty in the case, to my mind, is to account for so many sensible men having apparently admitted such a contradiction. And I will conclude with remarking on some of the causes which I think have brought this about.

‘1st. Though a probable law be a contradiction and absurdity, there is none in a law founded on probable reasons; and these two things the modern Sabbatarians are perpetually confounding. *E.g.*, there are very good reasons why wild animals should be preserved during certain seasons of the year. These reasons would not be alone sufficient, instead of a law to constitute it an act of moral turpitude to hunt and fish in these seasons (as it would be to kill a man, even were there no laws); but

they are very good reasons for enacting a law, by competent authority, making it penal to do so; and the observance of a law made by competent authority is part of a subject's duty. Now all these probabilities adduced for the observance of the Lord's-day are very good and strong as far as they go—*i.e.*, they are very good reasons for making this an ordinance of every church. But probabilities cannot constitute a law, though they may justify and strongly recommend a law (and if there be such a thing as a society called a church, it must have, in common with all societies, a right to enjoin, on its own members, conformity to rules not contrary to any prior obligation).

‘2nd. This is a case in which men impose on themselves by the fallacy of the Thaumatrope. On one side are painted (to obviate the absurdity of a probable law) the plain, earnest, and repeated injunctions to the Jews relative to their Sabbath; on the other side (to obviate the consequence of our having to keep the Jewish Sabbath), we have the New Testament allusions to the Christian assemblies on the first day of the week. By a repeated and rapid whirl, these two images are blended into one picture in the mind. But a steady view will show that they are on opposite sides of the card.

‘3rd. As there is hardly anything that men of sense will not bring themselves to admit on the slenderest evidence, when they are beforehand resolved upon it, so this predisposition is never stronger than when they are in extreme dread of some dangerous consequence from the opposite doctrine. Till they are satisfied that these consequences do not follow, they listen with invincible prejudice to all the positive arguments in favour of the obnoxious tenet; and this satisfaction, I have observed, is very rarely obtained. In order to attain truth, a man must first divest himself for the time of all prejudices, and

examine the arguments directly bearing on the question ; and after a candid examination of these, it is wonderful how soon, even to an ordinary understanding, the phantoms of danger will often melt away which had presented an insuperable obstacle to men of superior powers, while they gazed on these alone. *E.g.*, it was thought for a long time that Galileo's doctrines were utterly inconsistent with the Scriptures : as soon as men could bring themselves fairly to examine his arguments, they not only found that he was right, but that all his supposed inconsistency with Scripture was a phantom. I know several learned and intelligent divines who at this very time actually do concur in my opinions, but are afraid to avow them for fear of unsettling the minds of the people. But the number is probably far greater of those who, from that same apprehension, have brought themselves to adopt or to adhere to the contrary opinion. A man is very strongly tempted to maintain what he knows the most serious portion and also the great majority of his flock not only hold, but are so wedded to that they would raise a furious outcry against him for teaching otherwise. What he is thus desirous to maintain, he must very earnestly wish to believe ; and what a man is very anxious to believe, he will generally satisfy himself of, even by such means as, in any other case, he would think utterly worthless.

‘ Though I cannot but blame this surrender of the understanding to the will, especially where the doubly sacred rights of religious truth are concerned, I feel for the sake of a pastor thus circumstanced with his flock, as sincere a sympathy as for any possible case of human infirmity. Most trying is the situation of a man surrounded by those whose good opinion is every way most important to him ; who he knows will show him neither mercy nor justice if he takes the one side, and boundless

favour if he advocates the other ; who insist on his saying something in favour of their tenet, and are ready to assent to anything. It is a hard task for a man to stand quite steady and upright, when he is strongly pushed on the one side, and has a feather-bed to receive him as he falls on the other.'

The following extract from a letter to a friend bears the same date, and is therefore inserted here, though on a totally different subject :—

'Some attribute to you a certain excessive desire of independent originality, concerning which I am not prepared to decide positively whether it is, or is not, a part of your character. I am the worse judge, perhaps, from having—as far as I can judge from my own consciousness of the belief of those who know me best—quite a different disposition myself, being ready to give and take advice, to look out for anything worth imitating in any one's procedure, to lend or borrow freely, and instead of being ashamed to acknowledge that I am indebted to another for any suggestion, in any matter where the public good is concerned, to feel more ashamed of *not* having availed myself of any opportunity of doing so with advantage. The disposition I allude to, as attributed to you, is that you make it a point of honour never to be under an obligation to any one for a suggestion to anything you should think, or write, or say, or do—not from an idea of your being wiser than any one else, but from a feeling that you would by that be degraded, as much as by accepting a pecuniary obligation, even from one who was rich while you were poor. Just so, a highminded schoolboy would disdain receiving a schoolfellow's assistance in his exercise—not thinking that the other would not write better, but from considering it shabby to gain

credit not his own, when the exercise was set him as a trial of his own ability.

‘And this is quite right, in any case when we consider only, or chiefly, the trial and display of our powers. One who regards all his performances—all his conduct in life—with a view to credit only, will, if he has a nice sense of honour, take care that it shall be well-earned credit. But others there are who think, whenever the benefit of the public or of one’s neighbour is concerned, all selfish feelings, whether of interest, desire of glory, or ambition, should be as much as possible stifled. And as they expect of an honest physician that he should do everything he can to save his patient rather than his credit, and should be ready to avail himself of a hint from another physician, or from an old nurse, and be ashamed of nothing so much as of leaving anything undone that could have been done to effect a cure; so they hold themselves, in the discharge of any office—in a publication designed for instruction, or in anything else when the public good is concerned—to care nothing who has the credit, and to be careful only that the work done shall be as complete as possible. They limit their desire of originality and dread of plagiarism to such matters as a poem, a *bon-mot*, or anything of a merely ornamental character.

‘Now, as I have said, I am not prepared to decide which character is yours. But you will easily see my reason for applying to you to ask yourself the question.’

In this year (1835) the Archbishop was appointed a member of that Commission to inquire into the state of Ireland which opened the question of Irish Poor Laws—a question which produced so much of interest and discussion during the remainder of his life.

## CHAPTER X.

1836.

Visit of Dr. Arnold—Letters to Lord Stanley on Church Affairs in Ireland—Pressed by Mr. Senior to exchange for an English bishopric—Letter to Mr. Senior on same subject—His views on the importance of moral over intellectual education—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on the Irish Church—Letter to Rev. J. Tyler on *Neutrality* in case of Dr. Hampden—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff on University Examinations—Letter to Mr. Senior on various subjects connected with Church and State.

LITTLE is to be related of this year (1836) excepting what the letters tell. The Archbishop spent it chiefly in Ireland. A visit from his friend Dr. Arnold, with part of his family, formed a pleasant episode. One of the younger members of Dr. Arnold's family writes: 'I remember the Archbishop's taking the whole party to visit the Marlborough-street Model Schools. We met Mr. Blake there (the Roman Catholic commissioner for national education, for whom the Archbishop had a great esteem), I suppose by appointment, and heard him examine a large class, in which I think there were two Jews and several Protestants, in the Scripture lessons sanctioned by the Board of Common Instruction. The way in which he did it, so as to steer clear of all controverted matters, and yet elicit from the children the essential facts of the Scripture narrative, was exceedingly ingenious.'

The two following letters, though written at an interval of some months, are placed together, as being on the same subject:—

*To Lord Stanley.*

‘Dublin : January 28, 1836.

‘My dear Lord,—The letter of which I send you an abstract, and that in the “Evening Post” which I sent yesterday, though neither of them expressly designed for the purpose to which I now apply them, of meeting your lordship’s inquiries, will, I hope, prove satisfactory as to many of the points. The plan of redistribution from time to time involves, as you will see—1st, the substitution of one board for several, since the revenues of each diocese are not proportioned to the wants of each, any more than those of each parish ; and 2ndly, the vesting of all presentations in the Bishops conjointly with the Board—the Board to determine, on each vacancy that may occur, what stipend shall be allowed to the minister of this or that congregation, and the Bishop to decide who shall be that minister ; consequently the purchase of lay-advowsons and resignation of crown-livings was a necessary part of B. Baring’s scheme. But he was forced to propose that the lay-advowsons should be bought out of the church funds according to the present plan. Government could well afford to set aside a portion of the revenue accruing from the purchased by the composition for the purchase from time to time of the lay-advowsons, or might buy them up for the Church at once. The public would still have a good bargain. When we speak of the revenue of the Church being unimpaired, I do not mean that the clergy will receive all that the law now entitles them to, but as large a proportion as Sir R. Peel’s bill contemplated, if not more, with the advantage of being eased of all the expense and trouble and discomfort of collecting, and the whole being distributed among the clergy in a more equitable and useful manner. If any one can hope that

better terms than this can be obtained now at this third offer of the Sibyl, he must be made up of hope.

‘It is right to add, that the report of the Poor Inquiry Commission, which will be out in a few days, will contain a recommendation of that part of the plan which consists in commuting tithes for a land-tax in the hands of Government (by purchase), for providing the funds that will be required for affording relief in some of the modes which seem most indispensable.

‘As for the appropriation clause in the late bill, those who may have pressed for it, on purpose to injure or insult the Church, will of course be satisfied with nothing that would satisfy us; but there were certainly some—I trust a majority—who thought only (though perhaps too much) of lightening public burdens and of removing the scandal of a rich living with little or no congregation. Those who are of this mind I do hope may be satisfied by some such plan as the present.’

*Probably to the same.*

‘Dublin: July 12, 1836.

‘My dear Lord,—It is a matter of peculiar difficulty to find a man who can be relied on in respect of this question.

‘Suppose a man to have adopted the general principle, that the church revenues are national property, the superfluity of which may fairly be applied to other than church purposes; and suppose him to be also prepared, on certain data which have been laid before him, to apply this principle to the Church in Ireland: if he shall subsequently find that those data are erroneous, and that the real state of things is quite different from what he had been taught to believe, it is possible his views may be materially altered, without any inconsistency on his

part, and that he may consequently (supposing him a man of principle) come to a different practical conclusion.

‘Now the people of England are, I conceive, for the most part, by the direct assertions of one party and the implied admissions of the other, led or left to suppose that there is a large, or at least considerable, disposable surplus of church revenues in Ireland, beyond the reasonable wants of the Protestant population. I say “implied admission,” because when Conservative papers and debates descant on the inalienable character of church property and the purity of our religion, &c.—in short, when they dwell on arguments which might be just as suitably employed if the Protestant population were but one-half what it is, and the church revenues double,—the public are left to conclude that there is this surplus, and that the only question is how it should be disposed of.

‘Now I, as one of the ecclesiastical commissioners, know the fact that there are churches going to ruin which we have not funds to repair properly, besides many calls, to which we cannot respond, for building or enlarging churches, chapels, and glebe-houses, and for endowing several in places where a Protestant population has recently through some accident grown up; in short, that there is at this moment a reasonable call for more than 200,000*l.*, to meet which we have not above 90,000*l.*

‘And supposing any one to come to the knowledge of this, he may very well conclude that the surplus revenue of livings may most fairly be applied, in the first instance, to meet this deficiency; and on minute examination and calculation he will find that this alleged surplus has been miscalculated, and the utmost that can really be made of it would not even equal the above demand. Such a man therefore may, without any abandonment of the principle he had agreed to recognise, change his practical conclusion.

‘Nor is this any question that turns on how much is a sufficient provision for the clergy. I am willing to let the advocates of the principle of the appropriation clause fix this as they please, and then take the overplus to do what they will with it : the question is not whether their calculations are correct. I wish them to proceed thus :

‘The Protestant population, scattered in such-and-such a manner, requires—

|                                                           |   |    |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---|----|----|
|                                                           | £ | s. | d. |
| Rectors at . . . . .                                      |   |    |    |
| Curates at . . . . .                                      |   |    |    |
| Sextons, Churches, Glebe-houses to repair, &c., &c., at . |   |    |    |
| Total . . . . .                                           | £ |    |    |

Let this be secured to the Church, and dispose of the rest as national property for other purposes.

‘It was with this view I proposed as a final settlement the purchase of the whole tithes by Government for a fixed sum, to be paid down once for all, partly for the sake of a settlement, and partly because in that way, and in that way only, there would be an available surplus for Government ; and yet the Church would really, and not on paper only, retain what it was decided it ought to retain.

‘It would be impertinent to enter further into questions relative to the Irish Church than is necessary to show how difficult it must be to calculate with any certainty on a man’s vote, without being sure of his being better acquainted than most people are in England of the real state of Irish affairs.

‘Still a man might, though finding the case different from what he had supposed, acquiesce in harder terms than he approved of, for the sake of a termination of discord. But here again he might hesitate when he came to know the despair of any such result which prevails among

the most moderate Protestants here, in consequence of the declaration put forth in the name of the "Irish people" by their representative, that it is not a peace, but only a short truce, that is to be hoped for; so that though for the present they do not claim so-and-so, as soon as ever the bill shall have passed, fresh claims will immediately be made. If this is not the right interpretation, it is, at least as far as my knowledge goes, the one universally made, and that is to the present purpose. In fact, I have no hope whatever of permanent peace till the Irish clergy are maintained by Government. And as the spoliation of the revenues of the Roman Catholic Church was an act of the King and Legislature, so it is the part of the nation—the United Empire—to rectify the wrong, and that at the public expense; not leaving half the wrong unredressed, and throwing the burden of redressing the other half on the successors of those who happened at the time to reap the profit. As in the case of the West Indian planters, a wrong in which the nation was a party, should be remedied by the nation at large. To remedy an injury to one party by doing a like injustice afterwards to another party, is like the jockey's way of curing a lame horse by laming him on the opposite foot. But unluckily John Bull's love of justice is apt to go so far only as putting his hand into another's pocket and not his own. The only thing to be done is to point out the danger of a civil war—to show how much cheaper priests are maintained than soldiers—and to remind the English of the horse in the fable, who would not bear a part of the poor ass's burden while alive, and had to bear the whole of it when the poor beast was dead, and the hide into the bargain.'

The following letter was written by the Archbishop in answer to a suggestion of his friend Mr. Senior. He, in

common with others of the Archbishop's English friends, felt painfully the opposition and contumely he had to encounter in his diocese, and earnestly desired to see their friend in a sphere which they conceived would be more congenial to him, and would supply a more fruitful field for his powers—especially by enabling him to attend constantly in Parliament, and thus to acquire that permanent influence in the House which alternate sessions would not admit of. With these views, Mr. Senior pressed him to apply, or to consent to others applying for him, for an exchange to an English bishopric. The answer speaks for itself:—

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

‘March 9, 1836.

‘I had meant, but was too much hurried, to answer your last by return. Of course you know it is against my principles to ask Ministers for anything. But to say the truth, should they offer to let me retire (it would be a retirement) on an English bishopric, I should refuse. It may be that the state of Ireland is hopeless, but it never shall be said that I contributed to make it so. It would be thought (in my opinion justly—but at any rate it would be thought) that I had retreated from being hopeless of any adequate success, and being wearied out with opposition and obloquy. And this suspicion (I think it would be more than suspicion) would not only embitter all my future life, but would greatly cripple my exertions in an English diocese. If I were in an English diocese, and were offered Dublin, I should think twice before I accepted it, foregoing a situation in which I should have been actually doing good; but to “take up a fresh position” (as beaten generals call it), commodiously situated in the rear of my present, would bear, I think, but one interpretation. I wonder this did not strike you, especially

at such a crisis for Ireland. It seems to me that to accept advancement to an English archbishopric would be a very different thing; but should I find that this also would be interpreted in the same manner, this also shall be refused.

‘If you still differ from me, no more need be said; but if you fully adopt my views, and would write something to that effect that I could read or show, it might be of use.’

The fragment that follows is to a friend on the education of his son, a youth of considerable promise, in whom the Archbishop was much interested. His views on the importance of moral over merely intellectual education were always very strong:—

‘I warn you not to trust to intellectual powers for forming a moral character; at least till you can find, which I never could, some one instance of success. It is a great paradox, but it is true, that though honesty is the best policy, no one ever yet did (though in this or that particular case he may) steadily act upon it, without moral sentiment. The fact is, that it is only by long experience the truth of the maxim can be fully brought home to each man’s own understanding; and long before this experience can have been acquired, the moral character is so far formed that the habits are nearly inveterate. Many a sensualist in like manner comes to understand that temperance insures the greatest amount of bodily enjoyment, but not till after he is an incurable sot and debauchee.’

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

‘Dublin: Sept. 4, 1836.

‘My dear Lord,—I write a scrap to you, from time to time, as I get a gleam of leisure.

‘I have not been much more laboriously occupied lately than before, but have had more of what may be called professional occupation, having within these few months had a visitation, confirmation, consecration, and ordination—the last two, each for the first time.

‘You are quite right in what you say of the mystery that hangs over the affairs of Ireland. Men of no mean ability in other things, are here so weakly credulous in respect of such matters as they view through the discoloured medium of party, that they will give you, in all sincerity, a totally false account of what has passed before their eyes; and, again, men of some character, and upright in their private dealings, will think it no sin, but a duty, to give any representation that they think will serve the cause of their party. It is regarded as a *ruse de guerre*; just as a general, who would scorn the idea of turning traitor, would think it quite right to issue sham despatches, conceal his real forces, &c.

‘You have an incalculable advantage, so far as you are interested in Irish affairs, in being able to apply to one of whom you are assured, by an intimacy of above thirty years, that he is incapable not only of wilful deceit, but also of speaking as from knowledge when he is only giving conjectures, and also aloof from all parties, and anxious to ascertain the truth. Without this last qualification, a man of superior talents might spend his life here, and end it as ill-informed as he begun. But with an impartial desire to come at the truth, a man residing in the metropolis, and connected, as I am, by means of various boards, &c., with almost all parts of Ireland, must be the veriest blockhead that ever went about without a keeper, if he did not obtain accurate knowledge. My evidence before the Lords’ Committee was, not unreasonably, regarded with suspicion, as that of a man

of short experience ; but it has since been acknowledged by all who have the least portion of candour, and even by some who have none, that the information I had collected and the opinions I had formed in six weeks were more correct than those of many who had the experience of more than twice six years. And it would be strange indeed if, in the four-and-a-half years that have since elapsed, I had not greatly increased and rectified my knowledge.

‘As for the resistance to tithes giving way, believe it not. There may be some scattered and individual instances—so few, however, that in the last three months I have had to distribute more from the funds of the subscription than in three years preceding. But the great agitator’s credit, and his revenue, which rest on his credit, are staked on his keeping up the resistance ; and be assured if such an empire as his were falling, you would hear a much louder crash. Here and there one man suffers much more than he would have done by paying his tithe quietly, and he suffers as a martyr ; but for one such case there are fifty who keep the tithe in their pocket unmolested. So that it is no wonder a man of O’C.’s talents should maintain an ascendancy over those who have a pecuniary interest in his success.

Namque erit ille, mihi, semper Deus. . . .  
 Ille *meas errare boves*, ut cernis, et ipsum  
 Ludere quæ vellem. . . . . permissit,

expresses the feeling towards him of the bulk of the nation.

‘Still I do not give up all hope for the Church. The only chance—I do not say a very good one, but there is, I am convinced, no other—is in the adoption of some such principle as that of the petition you presented. Hitherto it has been opposed by two opposite parties ; by the

friends of the Establishment, because they do not, and by its enemies, because they do perceive its tendency to pacify Ireland and preserve the Church. An influential person among the latter class frankly avowed this, in reference to B. Baring's amendment, last year.

‘But the eyes of many of the opposite party are beginning to be opened. Lord Stanley's amendment aimed at the same object as the petition, though by a different machinery, and, I think, a far more inconvenient and inefficient. If that scheme were carried into effect, I will not venture to say that no agitation would be kept up in Ireland; but it would become much more difficult to keep it up than it has ever been yet. And that there is no other remedy, I am more and more convinced; and I find the conviction is making progress.

‘About the Romish priests, I will, as I said, tell you some curious particulars, if you should feel an interest in the subject.

‘Have you read Dr. Walsh's “Residence in Constantinople?” I trust I congratulate you on a pleasure to come. It is a most extraordinary portion of history, in the unaffected style of an unpretending and intelligent eyewitness. I have just presented him to a living.

‘The fifth edition (1500) of our “Logic” is just sold off, in a little more than two years; so that the one now in the press is 2000. Fellowes had calculated on 1500 lasting three years, but finds the sales gradually increase. As it is published on my own account, copies given away, to such as would not otherwise have bought them, cost me nothing but the value of the paper and presswork. You will please to understand, therefore, that if you wish to distribute any to “poor scholars,” an unlimited number is at your service. The same with the “Rhetoric,” of which a new edition is just out. Is it not very liberal of

me, when I have threshed your tree, to give you leave to pick up as much of the fruit as I do not want for myself?

‘I hope you have not abandoned the design of publishing some sermons relative to St. John.’

*On Neutrality.*<sup>1</sup>

‘Dublin : Sept. 30, 1836.’

‘My dear Tyler,—I would not have even the shadow of a suspicion that I myself was imputing motives to you. Neither I nor, as you truly observe, you yourself, nor any one but the Searcher of hearts, can be sure whether you were at all influenced, or in what degree, by a desire to escape censure. I only spoke my conjecture as to the suspicion likely to fall generally on those who stood neuter in the late contest, unless they should say or do something to justify that neutrality. Some reason for it they must have had, perhaps a very good one ; though I have heard none whatever, good or bad, alleged by any of them. In my conjecture, however, I was, it appears, in your case, partly mistaken. I do not know that I am a very competent judge of the question of “ what will people say ? ” At any rate you, being on the spot, must have had better opportunities than I for ascertaining beforehand what course would be acceptable to those around you. The censure you have met with from some, you had, I find, anticipated ; and I suppose you anticipated also the

<sup>1</sup> Occasioned by the proceedings at Oxford against the Archbishop’s early friend, Dr. Hampden. He preached the ‘Bampton Lectures’ in 1832. In 1836 he was appointed, by the Whig Government, Regius Professor of Divinity. A strong feeling of opposition was excited by the appointment, in consequence of the alleged tendency towards Rationalism of some passages in these lectures, which led to violent proceedings in Convocation.

approbation you have received from others. Neither you nor I can, as you observe, be sure how far motives of this kind operate on any one. We can only be sure that though human applause or censure do not make a thing right or wrong, they often make us think it right or wrong; that accordingly men are generally disposed to exercise a rigid scrutiny, in respect of this point, on the motives of each other; and that we ought to exercise a very, very rigid scrutiny on our own. The "temptation" (to most men at least) evidently is to be too much influenced by dread of reproach, reviling, and obloquy from furious party-men when vehemently excited.

‘When, therefore, you say that you were “strongly tempted to go and protest against the proceedings,” allow me to remark that what is commonly called temptation, lies, in such a case, entirely on the opposite side. It is this that has probably constituted the chief trial—more than the dread of mere bodily pain, of pecuniary loss, or of death to most of those martyrs and confessors who, at various periods, have stood forward to bear their testimony to truth and right, in defiance of the rage of a prevailing party. It may be called a moral martyrdom—a sort of fighting with beasts—to encounter the fierce words and looks of a great number of enraged men, inflamed by religious or political enthusiasm, especially when, as in the late case, they are at once exulting and mortified: exulting in a local and temporary triumph, and at the same time bitterly mortified by finding themselves defeated generally, and in their main object. It is observed that soldiers are usually the most cruel when, after having been beaten, they fall in with some small detachment which they can overpower. This moral martyrdom, then, being so very trying to our fortitude, we should be the more distrustful of our own motives when we feel inclined to

shrink from it. The "temptation" to face it is at least not likely to be strong. And certainly, as a general rule, all would, I suppose, admit that we are called upon to face it when occasion arises. The presumption—the plain *primâ facie* rule of duty is, when in any important matter the body we belong to is committing a flagrant wrong, to come forward and oppose it. Even if there is no chance of our ultimately preventing that particular act, much benefit may hereafter arise from our having done our best to show that it was not perpetrated "*nemine dissente*" (since that is always, and not without reason, made a matter of great boast); and at any rate it is doing great good, as far as we are ourselves concerned, to be able to say with truth; "I had no hand in this; it was done not only without me, but against my protest."

'Such, I say, is the general rule. Should any one doubt this—which I suppose very few would deny—let him consider the general tendency of the opposite rule. If whenever a party of furious bigots have gained a majority in favour of some extravagant or unjust measure, all who are not of that party should make it their rule to stand neuter till the violent passions had cooled, the result would plainly be that the most violent and irrational would be likely in each body to bear rule unresisted. Whenever they could best overawe some (as they always must do) into joining them, they would be secure, as long as they were but sufficiently violent, of being unopposed by the rest. "Stand out of our way, for we are intoxicated, and if we are opposed we shall be mad," is an argument which would be continually brought into play, if men universally were thus to yield to it.

'Of the general rule, then, there can, I think, be no doubt; but I will not presume to say there can be no cases of exception, though none have, in this instance,

come to my knowledge. A man may fairly be called on to show cause (perhaps he may be able to do so) why he should not go to protest against any wrongful act committed by the body of which he is a member. That he can do more good by not going is indeed a plea very much to the purpose, when proved ; but it needs to be proved—not taken for granted—before it can be admitted. And if after mature deliberation there remains a doubt, the decision should clearly be on the side of the simple general rule, of protesting against injustice and aggression. Now, you may recollect that in your first letter you adverted to two considerations only that directly bear on the question, and both of these were against the neutral source :—first, that the proceeding of the University against Hampden is utterly unjustifiable was a *primâ facie* reason for protesting against it ; and secondly, that you did not yourself consider Hampden as the best qualified for the office was a strong additional reason. For when we differ from a man in any of his views, it is the more incumbent on us to allow him fair play, and to demand it in his favour. Any one who had been known as a strenuous advocate of Hampden's theological opinions might perhaps be considered as having already in some measure recorded his protest against the prosecution of them ; but one who differs from him in opinion is the more called on to make it quite clear that he disclaims all unfair proceedings against him. The opinion of us Protestants as to the proceedings of the Inquisition against Protestants may be taken for granted, and so may that of the Irish Catholics as to the penal code ; but I never let pass any suitable occasion of testifying my abhorrence of that penal code, precisely because I am opposed to the Roman Catholic religion. And if the revival of those laws or any other persecuting measure were proposed in the House

while I was a member, I should not think it enough to take no part; for if on the one hand I might be reckoned less guilty, as being neutral, than those actively advocating the persecution, on the other hand it might be urged, as a set-off against this, that I had not, like them, the plea, such as it is, of erroneous belief. "They might really think they were doing God service," and might be perpetrating what they believed to be right, while I should have been conniving at what I knew to be wrong.

'The considerations, therefore, which you adverted to are, I think, very strong in favour of the course of those who went to vote against the statute. They seem to me sufficient (in the absence of any strong reasons on the opposite side) to put an end to all doubt on the question; though when a doubt does remain, the presumption remains, as I said, on the side of the general rule, and on the side against which we are tempted by the weakness of our nature. But there are other considerations, besides, tending the same way, which, though comparatively much weaker, are such as I think would be in themselves decisive. For instance, the proceedings, independently of all other views, were of a decidedly schismatical character. A member, and still more a minister, of our establishment is called on to protest against them, not only as a moral man and a Christian, but also distinctly as a churchman. If some faction had been raised on political grounds against a lay professor of law, for instance, or of chemistry, and had proceeded in a like unjustifiable way, every upright member of the University who saw the injustice would have been called on, I think, to come forward and protest against it. But when a clergyman is denounced as heretical by his own brethren, who refuse to call on the bishop or any ecclesiastical authority to decide the cause,

and bind themselves together like the trades-unionists, or any other unauthorised combination, to fix on him a public stigma affecting his clerical character—and this, not after having received a decision contrary to their wishes, but after having declined any such reference to Church authority—it is plain that their conduct, even supposing Hampden guilty of all the heresies imputed, is most emphatically schismatical.

‘What becomes of a civil community, or of any community, if the members of it (some of them, while others stand still and let them have their way) take upon them utterly to set at nought all the constituted authorities of the community, and proceed as plaintiff, judge, jury, and executioner, all in one, to right themselves, or wrong their neighbour, at their own pleasure, and, without reference to any regular magistrate, to punish by taking away his property, or by banishment, death, &c., any one they might think deserving of it? Why, surely, supposing the man did deserve it, these persons would be justly regarded as striking at the very root of civil government and social order. And so also, in a Church, a corresponding procedure goes to subvert the very idea of an orderly Christian community. It is accordingly exactly what Paul so solemnly denounced in those Corinthians who took upon them to form parties at their own pleasure, and to excommunicate their brethren without regular ecclesiastical sentence. Such a course is also, I think, in direct violation of Our Lord’s own express commands, and strikes at the root of Church union, order, and peace. Our ordination-vow accordingly binds us, I conceive, not only not to take part in any such schismatical proceedings, but, when they do arise, to take part as occasion shall offer against them.

‘The other considerations are indeed much stronger, but

this last appears to me to be in itself very strong indeed. And perhaps there are some who do not as yet perceive that their conduct is unjust, unchristian, and inhuman, who yet may be made to understand that it is schismatical.

‘But still, as I said before, I will not venture to say that there may not be some good reason in favour of neutrality; and of this you may be assured, that it would afford me the highest gratification to find that you had obtained by it power and influence and opportunity, and that you came forward manfully to avail yourself of the advantage—to do some essential service to the cause of truth, and to the Church, and to the University.

‘I do not apologise for the length of this letter, because you must very well know that I could worse spare time for writing it, than you for reading it; nor for anything unpalatable in the matter of it, because you must be sure that I have been performing an office far less agreeable to myself, as well as to you, than if I could have bestowed unqualified approbation. You will naturally be inclined to listen more favourably to those who commend than those who disapprove your course, especially as the step is already taken. And I might on that very plea have excused myself, by saying to my conscience, “there was no good to be done.” But though I did not feel bound to obtrude either my advice before, or my judgment afterwards, unasked, I felt that when I was applied to, and that too by an old friend, with whom I had so often consulted, I should not have been justified, either in point of friendship or of rectitude—I should not have been clear of giving my sanction to what I think wrong—if I did not state my own views frankly and plainly. It is at any rate doing some good to be able to say, *Liberavi animam meam*.

‘Very sincerely yours,

‘R. D.’

*Extract of a letter to Mr. Senior.*

‘Dublin: Oct. 2, 1836.

‘My dear S.,—A great proportion of those who come to Ireland to see things with their own eyes, and then declare the opinions they have formed of “Ireland, its evils, and their remedies,” might just as well have stayed at home, since they come to seek, not conclusions, but premises.

‘They bring with them ready-made theories and plans, and then declare that everything they have seen and heard in Ireland has confirmed their convictions; which is true enough, because they come to listen to the “bells,” and everything that they meet with is viewed through the medium of their own prepossessions. “As the fool thinketh, so the bell clinketh.” Now some of these plans and theories may be very right, and at any rate they may be right in assuring the public that such is their sincere conviction; and it may be true also that it has been formed in Ireland, though this might have taken place while they were fly-fishing in the Lake of Killarney. The abuse of the public is in pretending that their opinion is, when it is not, derived from what they have observed here. “Oh, but they have seen the state of things!” They have seen, that is, that there is distress, and dirt, and drunkenness—just what nobody in or out of Ireland doubts. But that on which the doubts exist, viz., whether this or that mode of remedy for those evils would be safe and effectual—have they seen this? or do they expect to see it before the trial is made? “In my mind’s eye, Horatio.” They often, I believe, deceive themselves, as well as others, in the same way as the believers in ghost and fairy stories. A man goes and sees the Eildon Hills, with three tops, and is told it was done by Michael

Scott's demon, and returns with a confused notion as to what it is that he is competent to bear witness to.

'I have seen ——, who is gone on a tour through Ireland, to form the conclusion that workhouses on a similar plan to those of England will be a safe and effectual remedy for the distresses of Ireland.

'I do not say that he is not right in this; I only foretell that he will come back with that conclusion because he took it out with him, and is not likely to lose it on the road, but, on the contrary, to be confirmed in it by all he sees and hears, because he is, as far as I can judge, "gone to listen to the bells."'

*To the Bishop of Llandaff.*

'Dublin: Oct. 19, 1836.

'My dear Lord,—It gave me great pleasure to hear a continued good account of you. I am myself dreadfully hard-worked, and often in an unsatisfactory way, partly owing to the defect in our system of (so-called) Church government, to which you advert. And I believe every bishop who at all attempts to do his duty finds something of the same inconvenience. Why, then, do they not meet together, and agree to submit some plan to the Legislature? Because they fear they should not be listened to? Perhaps not; but at least they would feel that they had done their part. And I own I am mystified to see the bishops only coming forward when some question of temporalities is discussed, and in what relates to their own episcopal functions taking no public step, even when their private opinions are most decided. If you would take the lead in this matter, I do think many would follow: one you may be sure of, as I am in Parliament.

'I am sure you know me too well to attribute to me

what is in truth the worst kind of credulity—hasty prejudice against an honest man, or one who may be honest, founded on the detection of a knave. But you may recollect that I only pointed out the necessity (and that, by-the-bye, Mr. ——'s case does prove, were proof needed) of careful inquiry and examination, even when a man brings such high testimonials as might seem to supersede the necessity of it. Examination wrongs no one. Genuine coin is not damaged by the test, and counterfeit deserves detection. And my experience would have convinced me, had I doubted it, that some zealous Protestants are so eager for a convert, that they hastily take for granted a man's being a sincere Protestant if he does but echo all they say, and answer leading questions to their wish ; when perhaps he is, as I have found in some cases, too ignorant (to waive all suspicions of deliberate falsehood) to be properly called either Roman Catholic or Protestant, from his knowing, I may say, nothing of either the one religion or the other. Mr. ——, for instance, I found more ignorant of the Bible than you would suppose any child of twelve years could be in a tolerable charity-school. He set up, moreover, for a classical and mathematical tutor, and was believed on his bare word, till I found him unable to construe correctly a plain Latin sentence, barely knowing the Greek letters, and not knowing what a triangle is. To prevent mistakes, I gave him a bit of paper, and told him to draw one, which he did thus Y. Yet he had been engaged as tutor in a gentleman's family !

‘Several professedly-converted priests have applied to me for preferment, and in the meantime for license to officiate in the diocese. I always received them courteously, and gave them credit for perfect sincerity, as I always do to every man when unconvicted ; but I always

examined them, and though they varied in their degree of knowledge, or rather of ignorance, I have never yet met with one who even approached such a point of qualification that I could conscientiously admit him to even the humblest office in the ministry. I do feel assured, therefore, that I was right in submitting them to examination, which, though it will not always (it will sometimes) detect a cheat, will at least detect an ignoramus. One of these was a Mr. —, who has been making a figure as a controversial pamphleteer. On being, after examination, remitted to his studies, he went to one of my chaplains to borrow a Greek Testament, and sat in his rooms half an hour, aided by him in making out a few verses; on which he entreated Dr. — to report to me that he had been studying the Greek Testament under him, and had made good progress. From this man himself I elicited a history of his own conversion, which certainly might be called in our language<sup>1</sup> a “conversion per accidens,” totally at variance with the account given me of it by —.

‘But Mr. —’s case is not necessarily unfavourable to the character of the priests, since there is great reason to doubt his being one. Of the second, Mr. —, there is little or no doubt, there being about as much proof as a negative can have that he is no priest. That he is a most impudent cheat was proved above two years ago, and is so well known to almost every clergyman in Dublin, that one can hardly believe those who are putting him forward can be ignorant of his character; at least they certainly have abundant evidence within their reach of his having produced a forged letter, and other such tricks. These things so far surpass the boundaries of English audacity,

<sup>1</sup> That of Aldrich’s Logic.

that people in England are loth to credit them. And I do not ask any one but old friends, like you, to believe them on my word. But I never say anything I cannot bring evidence of; and as for qualifications in point of knowledge, I only recommend people to examine, and then judge for themselves. There is another Mr. ———, whom I examined; and finding him knowing nothing of Greek, very little of Latin, and not much of English, refused him permission to officiate. I understand he has obtained a preferment in England, which I must needs suppose is on the strength of testimonials (of which he brought me abundance), and not of examination. I do not wonder that some persons of this description should now betake themselves to such as proceed on a different plan from mine; but I defy any one to say, and you, I am sure, will testify to my being incapable of it, that I ever manifest a prejudice against one man from what I have detected in another.'

‘Wednesday, Nov. 16, 1836.

‘My dear Senior,—I have received both yours. L——’s views seem reasonable, but I think more of your prophetic powers than his, when I remember the confidence with which he anticipated, in spite of your warning, the permanence of the late ministry.

‘The only door open, that I can see, to settle the question of the appropriation clause, so as not to clash with the opposite pledges, is that suggested in the petition presented last session from fifty of the clergy here—viz., the Government buying the tithes (at sixteen years’ purchase) for a sum of money (borrowed at about fifty years’ purchase) to be made over to an ecclesiastical board, by which means there could be a surplus without anything being lost by the Church.

‘I dread the session, expecting I shall do more harm than good, through the prejudice of both extremes against anything coming from me. I see fresh proofs every day of the jealousy with which the agitating party watch against any restoration of the influence I once had with Government; and the jealousy of the opposite side is as fierce as ever. I must come over, as staying away wilfully would do more still; but if any unavoidable accident kept me away, I believe things would go on better.

‘Supposing your anticipations well-founded, it is hardly probable to avoid going a step further, if, at least, the Tories profit as little by experience as they have hitherto. Your anticipated position of Peel and Co. next November is quite analogous to that in which they were seven years ago, when they held out as long as they could, and then surrendered at discretion for fear of a civil war.

‘I hear that ministers—some of them—are disposed to listen to proposals for paying the Roman Catholic priests. Can you think of any detailed plan for it? It is on detail that the success or failure must depend. No principles, I think, should be recognised that would alarm the English. There is now an allowance from Government to priests attending prisons, and they are seeking it for regimental Roman Catholic chaplains.

‘Mr. Drummond concurs with me as to the transportation system, and laments the increased abuse to which it has lately led—viz., detaining convicts in a crowded prison-ship five or six months previous to the voyage.’

*Extract from a Letter.*

‘ Dublin: Friday, Dec. 9, 1836.

‘ Be assured, my dear friend, of the grateful affection with which I always receive your sympathy and kindness. What you suggest about a public expression of my zeal in the cause of Protestantism, would perhaps come well, if judiciously managed, from some of my friends here or in England, provided it were so done as not to indicate too much respect for contemptible slanderers. For me to say anything myself that could be even construed into anything like a reply to newspaper attacks, would, I am convinced, multiply them tenfold, and would be hailed by them, not unreasonably, as a kind of victory. He who wrestles with a chimney-sweeper is sure to be smutted, whether he fall over or under. They have many and great advantages in a controversy: having no character to lose, having no scruples about truth or decency, being sure of a crowd of willing hearers among their partisans, and obtaining what with the vulgar is the test of victory, the last word—which they always will unless a man consents to give up the rest of his life to a paper war. But those who are really wise and good will soon see, when they take time to reflect, how silly as well as wicked it is to credit accusations without evidence, on the bare word of avowed enemies, whose language and whole conduct moreover are such as to show plainly what they are. And as for those who are not wise and good except in pretence, it is in vain to communicate true information to them, because they are only contriving how to conceal and distort the truths they do know. *E.g.*, the primate, a few years ago, with very good intentions, raised a fund by collecting subscriptions from many persons, among the rest some of the English bishops, for

the support of Roman Catholic converted priests ; a good deal of money was raised, and a number of converts received ; and all, or nearly all, of them turned out such a disgrace to the Church that he abandoned the plan, and to other day refused an application made to him (as well as to me) for joining a society formed for such a purpose. He now prefers (as I have already done) doing everything of that kind in private, and holding out no proclaimed bonus for converts. All this I had from himself a few days ago, and I know and could prove that it is perfectly well known to the very persons who are attacking me for pursuing the same course. But not a word do they say against him ! His turn is not yet come.

The party which may be called the anti-episcopal understand well that part of tactics which consists in attacking an enemy in detail. If the divisions do not support each other, the victory is certain. They show their skill also in beginning with me, with the one the most likely to be left unsupported, like Uriah the Hittite, to be slain with the sword of the Ammonites, because of the personal and party jealousy existing against me for being an Englishman, for refusing to join any party, for having been appointed by an obnoxious minister, and other reasons. Hence the radical papers have for some time ceased their attacks. Some time ago one of them began a series of letters attacking my "Errors of Romanism," but suddenly stopped short—I have no doubt upon receiving a hint that there were Protestants doing their work for them much better, and that it was worse than a waste of powder to fire at one who was cannonaded by their opponents.

‘Hence it is, I have no doubt, that the anti-episcopals single me out for attack on points where they well know that other bishops approve and have done the same things, which in me are reprobated, but in others passed

by. Who would suppose, for instance, from their newspaper attacks, that I had not been singular in issuing an inhibition? Who would guess that several clergymen of this diocese (whose names are among those signed to the “memorial”) have been actually inhibited by the primate from preaching in his diocese? But when through *my* sides they shall have given a stab to episcopal authority, see whether they will stop there!

“Woe, woe for England! not a whit for me.” I myself have had no more to encounter than I always calculated upon, and no more than I always felt I could have avoided, either by joining a party, or by remaining inert. But alas for the Church! If none come forward to make even a demonstration in my cause, which is equally their own, I, though I hope I shall never flinch from my duty, shall be quite unable to maintain the post alone.

“*Tua res agitur paries cum proximus ardet*” is indeed a very true maxim, but it seldom operates in practice; an honest, generous, and courageous character is always before it—the mean, timorous, and selfish usually behind it; *i.e.*, he perceives the danger of letting his neighbour’s house burn, only when his own has caught fire.’

## CHAPTER XI.

1837.

Letter to a clergyman on Religion—Letters to Rev. J. Tyler on Invocation of Saints, &c.—Letter to Dr. Dickinson—Letters to Bishop of Norwich on Irish Church questions, &c.—Letter on ‘Evidences of Christianity’—Letter to Blanco White, and generous concern for his welfare—Letter to Dr. Dickinson on Abolition of Superfluous Oaths—Letter to Lord John Russell—Letter to a lady on State of Ireland—Table Talk: on Tractarianism—Letter to Mr. Senior on Colonisation—His views on the Government Poor Law measure for Ireland—Letters to Mr. Senior on same subject—Petition to the Queen on Administration of Oaths by Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick.

THE first letter of this year (1837) is addressed to a clerical friend, who had written to consult him on some matters which were strongly occupying his mind. The subject will be seen in the answer:—

*To a Clergyman, in reply to a letter written by him.*

‘February 1837.

‘Supposing you strongly impressed with the sentiments you express, I should say, to you and to all who are experiencing a similar awakening, that what you have most to guard against is impatience. He who has lost a great deal of time, and is anxious to repair the loss, is apt first to *wish* for (which is quite right and natural), and then to *expect* (which is most absurd), a proportionally rapid progress in recovering his lost ground. And the end

commonly is, that he either grows soon “weary in well-doing,” or else, in seeking a short cut, strikes into a wrong path, and goes irrecoverably astray. The error is not by any means peculiar to the case of religion and morals. A man in travelling has lagged behind, and then gallops on impatiently and knocks up his horse, or strikes across fields and loses his way. A man has been idle at college, and seeks to make up, just at the last, by reading fourteen hours a day instead of seven, because, forsooth, he has twice as much to do as a steady student; but his wants cannot give him corresponding powers; his former idleness makes application the more, not the less, fatiguing, and also the less available in point of progress. And I have often seen such a man either lay himself up by illness, or, by hurried and superficial study, fail of the advancement he might have made. The same thing may be seen in those who are in a hurry to recover strength and flesh after an illness, and in a multitude of other cases.

‘A man who is in any respect reforming should be cautioned, not indeed against being too earnest and diligent, but against being impatient. You must warn such a man to make up his mind to meet with much greater toil and difficulty in pursuing the path of duty than those who have long pursued it, and yet with all his exertion to find himself for a considerable time falling short of them. The poorer a man is, the more hard will he have to labour for small gains, inferior to what a richer makes with less labour. This is very mortifying, but a poor man who will not make up his mind to this will never become rich.

‘Even the “conviction of sin” (which is the favourite phrase of certain religionists) is not to be administered with effect, as some spiritual quacks do, as a first dose, to be

gulped down all at once like a bolus. You must warn the self-reformer that if he is really in the right way, and keeps to it, he will have much more of genuine conviction of sin a year hence than he has now, because his standard will have risen, his moral and spiritual taste improved, as he advances. As the light grows brighter he will see more and more of the stains, and will find himself, when considerably advanced, really backward even than he had fancied himself at starting. All this (though he ought to take it as a good sign) is humiliating, and will prove, if it come unexpectedly and without previous warning, disheartening. But it is the appointment of Providence, and it is of no use to attempt to disguise it, that humility is the only road to improvement; that a double portion of patient and humble labour is necessary for those who have lagged behind; and that humility is an alterative medicine which must be swallowed drop by drop, without seeking to evade its bitterness in any way if it is to operate rightly.

‘ Warn men against hoping for and seeking a short cut to Christian perfection because, forsooth, they wish for it and need it. Those are mere quacks who profess to wash away the effects of a life of intemperance by a few draughts of their balms and elixirs; they give a delusive stimulus to an enfeebled constitution, and hurry their deluded patient to the grave. And those spiritual quacks who teach men to dispense with a “patient continuance in well-doing,” and flatter to his ruin the wretched dupe, who turns away impatiently from sound advisers—from such as prescribe, to one peculiarly averse to (because unaccustomed to) all exertion after practical holiness, that double exertion which, for this very reason, is needful. Many a stray lamb returning to the fold is intercepted by these wolves in sheep’s clothing.

‘The usual result is, that while for a time some evils are corrected, others and worse come in their place: for instance, for thoughtless and reckless confidence is substituted spiritual pride under the guise of humility; for a mixture of malignant envy with veneration felt towards better Christians, a still more malignant contempt; for utter carelessness about God, a familiar and most degrading and injurious idea of Him; and ultimately, very often a return, and more than return, to the “world and the flesh,” in addition to the devil; with the addition of a firm belief that they are still accounted righteous on account of Christ’s righteousness being imputed to them and reckoned as theirs. The evil spirit returns accompanied by seven worse, and “they enter in and dwell there, and the last state of that man is worse than the first.”’

In this year (1837) the Archbishop was again in Parliament, taking an active part in all that could bear upon Irish affairs. The principal object on which he was engaged in this session, was that of bringing before the Government the results of the inquiries made into the working of the new educational system. The Archbishop was examined as a witness before a committee of the House of Lords on this subject.

The letters to his friend Mr. Tyler, the Rector of St. Giles, which appear as among the earliest of this year, are on points which he regarded as of deep importance—the Saints’ Invocations, and the deprecation of appeal to evidence in the Romish Church:—

‘Dublin: March 17, 1837.

‘My dear Tyler,— . . . Of course I should never have thought of retaining any allusion to my own confirmations. But what a pity it is that the administration of the

Eucharist does not always accompany the rite! It does, to be sure, greatly increase my labour. But when I become too feeble to bear the fatigue, I shall withdraw after the Confirmation, but still leave the clergy to celebrate the Communion. If you were to ask my clergy, including many who have not even yet shaken off their prejudices against me, you would find nearly all of them agreed that the number of habitual communicants is about doubled, or more, since I came, and that a great portion of this increase is from the rule of not leaving the young people to wait till "a more convenient season." Any additional verbal alterations or omissions you may make at your own discretion.

'I quite agree with you that the greatest practical corruption of the unreformed churches (for the Greek is on a level with the Romish in that) is the Invocation of Saints. It is a most insidious error, because it creeps in under the guise of humility. A man of any modesty would not push himself at once into the presence of the Queen, but would rather apply to some of her servants, unless expressly forbidden.

'The ultimate result is that omniscience and omnipresence are attributed to saints, and what really amounts to worship becomes confined to creatures. If you, or some one for you, would put into the form of a popular tract your book on Mariolatry, and add a simple proof that the safe side (for that is the stronghold of the saint-invokers) is not for but against it, I think it would be very useful as a "tract for the times."

' "The horse," says a French proverb, "is not quite escaped who drags his halter." Now the halter of our Church in this matter is the retaining of the title of saints in a different sense from that in which it is invariably used by the Scripture writers. In their sense the

humblest Christian is just as truly a saint as Peter or Paul. Thence comes the idea that a less degree of personal holiness will suffice for the salvation of an ordinary Christian than of an inspired man, or one who has performed sensible miracles. Thence we are led to think of admiring at a distance their personal holiness, without dreaming of being so presumptuous as to imitate it. Thence comes, again, a hope of their intercession; and thence, ultimately, worship.'

*To the same.*

'April 22, (probably) 1837.

. . . . . 'Your reviser is very likely not aware of the extent to which, in Ireland at least, the notion prevails and is inculcated, that it is a most desirable thing to keep as many as possible from inquiring after any kind of evidence, and that those are to be most macarized who acquiesce with the most complete satisfaction in whatever they are told. That this should be the case with five-sixths of our population is not perhaps much to be wondered at; but I find the same views prevailing to a wonderful extent among Protestants also, including the most zealous anti-Papists. I am most desirous to withdraw any censure I may be supposed to have cast on any who walk, as well as they can, in the best light or twilight they can find; the censure is for those who designedly leave or keep their people or themselves in darkness or in twilight, in preference to clearer light, and who wish that while people are (and will be, whether we choose or not) advancing in the exercise of their faculties, and in knowledge in all other departments, they should be brought down to a lower level of contented ignorance in

religion than was deemed sufficient even for slaves and semibarbarians 1800 years ago.

‘ If any popular proofs which are wanting can be supplied of the genuineness and authenticity of the sacred books, I shall rejoice to see it done. But it is going too far to presume that no one needs to have it shown that there are proofs accessible to ordinary men of the existence and antiquity of Greek and Hebrew writings.

‘ A man of great learning and ability may chance to have never met with any one who had any doubts on that point; but this hardly warrants the assertion of the negative, unless at least he had conversed (as I have) with persons who have been present at the debating-clubs in the neighbourhood of Manchester, &c., and who have had intercourse with the members of those clubs. If he had, he would have found, I think, reasons for a different conclusion. Among the educated classes, indeed, there are probably few unbelievers who do not admit the antiquity, and deny the authenticity, of our sacred books; but it is not so with the uneducated. And in this I stand alone: I will undertake to say there are multitudes who do admit the existence of those ancient books, but who believe this only—and are confident that it can be believed only—on the very same ground on which they admit the authenticity both of those books and likewise of all the legends and traditions of the Romish Church,—viz., the word of their priests, who neither care nor will give them any other reason. Perhaps all that relates to the Romish Church may be thought of very little moment in reference to the publications of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. But the fact is, a great number of Roman Catholics are now beginning to read—and, to Bishop MacHale’s extreme alarm, to read the Evidences!’

*To Dr. Dickinson.*

‘Kensington: 1837.

‘My dear D.,—I start at six this evening. We had a most crowded house, especially of bishops.<sup>1</sup>

‘The Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London told me I had said nothing but what they fully concurred in. The Bishop of Norwich laid himself open to the answers of a most skilful debater, who had also the advantage in his cause of all that made for him, right and wrong, on the surface and agreeable to the politics of the hearers, and all that made for the other side requiring close examination. The Bishop of Norwich thinks of publishing a pamphlet.

‘I think a pamphlet is wanted on my side also, in the form of a letter to the bishops, urging them to undertake in earnest what they have professed and promised, reminding them that the matter has been six years before them from myself, and reminding them also of my having consulted them by a circular on a most important point, on which, though the majority decided with me, one decided against me, and a considerable number could not (I am bound in courtesy to suppose) make up their minds.

‘I saw Lord Normanby<sup>2</sup> yesterday. He could say nothing against my proposal of an island on the British coast, except the supposed greater dread of distant banishment.’

The two letters which follow, addressed to the Bishop of Norwich, are on a subject at this time deeply engrossing

<sup>1</sup> The reference apparently is to the debate in the Lords of May 8, 1837, on the Education Board—in which the Archbishop took part.

<sup>2</sup> Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland from May 1835 to April 1839. The proposal in question had probably reference to some transportation scheme.

the Archbishop's mind. He was now engaged in the second of that series of 'Easy Lessons,' which were carried on at intervals throughout his life, and which, small and unpretending as they appeared, he regarded as of more real importance than his larger works. The first of the series, 'Lessons on Money Matters,' had been an endeavour to bring the leading principles of Political Economy within the comprehension of the young and unlearned. The second, which he was now commencing, was on a subject of higher importance, 'The Evidences of the Truth of Christianity.'<sup>1</sup> He was desirous of placing within the reach of the mass of the people clear and comprehensive views of the religion they profess—such as might enable a humble and moderately-instructed Christian to 'give a reason of the hope that is in him':—

*To the Bishop of Norwich.*

'Upper Brook Street: July 21, 1837.

'My dear Lord,—I called to mention to you the present condition of my long-meditated Diocesan Theological Seminary at Dublin, which wants to be set agoing by a Royal Charter to enable me to endow it.

'This there was a difficulty in obtaining during the late reign, which I hope may not be found in this.

'Any particulars of it that may interest you, I shall be most happy to submit to you.

'In brief, it is designed to occupy profitably the two years usually either wasted, or not effectually employed, between the degree and ordination.

'If in the number of the "Saturday Magazine" you find anything of which you suspect the author, pray conceal

<sup>1</sup> First published in the 'Saturday Magazine.'

your suspicions till the whole shall have been out, and in the Dublin Reading-books, else the object would be very likely defeated.

‘I have not been able to forbear stealing two copies of an address which, I observe, is not to be had for money.

‘By-the-bye, when you are about confirming, you may possibly find a use for a popular tract of mine (which Fellowes has) on “Confirmation,” which has been widely circulated, being a little altered, with a view to clearness, from the Christian Knowledge Society.

‘Ever, my dear Lord, yours very truly,

‘R. DUBLIN.’

*To the Bishop of Norwich.*

‘Leamington: July 25, 1837.

‘My dear Lord,— . . . I am very glad you approve of the attempt. I am beginning to give an outline of the Evidences, chiefly for the benefit of the Roman Catholics, who are in great danger from the sudden influx of light; and yet we are neither authorised nor able to keep them any longer in darkness. If, first, education be spread; secondly, universal scepticism be guarded against, which is the danger of the transition state; thirdly, Maynooth be reformed (of which there is some hope); fourthly, if the payment of the priests can be brought about; and fifthly (last but not least), if the Sovereign can be brought to visit Ireland—not once for all, like George IV., but as a resident for at least a month or two every year or two—Ireland may become a really valuable portion of the British Empire, instead of a sort of morbid excrescence. In some of these objects you have been a most valuable

aid, and perhaps may be in more; besides which, I hope both for your advice and example in that important change—the introduction of a professional training for the clergy.

‘I hope you will deserve and obtain, besides higher rewards, the glory of being valued by those whose praise is a real credit, and liberally abused by those whose abuse is the only glory they can confer.’

The following letter to a friend (date unknown) may be inserted here, as bearing on the same subject :—

*To ——— on the ‘Evidences of Christianity.’*

‘I see what I should have inserted in the passage where I speak of miraculous evidence as needed to establish a religious truth not obviously revealed in Scripture. I should have said that “without such evidence it is not to be preached as an essential part of the Christian Revelation.” Of course if you prove to a man that so-and-so is contained in the Bible, he will, as you observe, believe that it is so. But the danger is that he will be apt to believe more—viz., that he must set it forth as a necessary part of the Christian faith. Now, if it be something which whole churches for whole generations may have never found in their habitual study of Scripture, we are not justified in so regarding it. So, *e.g.* there are many who think that an intermediate state of consciousness is declared in Scripture, and some a state of unconsciousness; but I think each of them unjustifiable in making either an essential article of faith. If, indeed, God designed that certain privileged persons should be the depositaries of Gospel revelation, and that the mass of Christians were to receive implicitly whatever these taught, provided

these could show Scripture warrant (*i.e.* what they decided to be such) for their doctrines, then indeed the slightest hint that would be understood by these initiated few—a “word to the wise”—would be a sufficient revelation. And here lies, as it strikes me, the great danger from the traditionists. It is in vain that they disavow, however sincerely, all right to teach anything not contained in Scripture. I would not care a straw to have such a right if you would but allow me to teach whatever I can confirm from Scripture; making the slightest hint serve for that purpose, and reserving to myself the right of deciding whether that hint in Scripture does serve the purpose or not. I can hammer out the Bible (or any other book) into leaf-gold, and gild over with portions of it any assignable amount of tradition or of conjectural speculation.

‘It is in this way that sundry ships in our service boast of being the very vessels taken from the French. It is true they have undergone a thorough repair, only one beam of the original ship remaining, and the rest being British.

‘I remember a learned Jew assuring me that the prohibition they observe against eating flesh and butter at the same meal, was founded on the Law of Moses; and so it is, if you allow his traditional interpretation of the Law. But I would give any biblical scholar a year to find out the passage.<sup>1</sup> Now supposing his interpretation (instead of being a mere fancy) had been correct, I say it was not so obvious as to be insisted on as an article of faith, without miraculous evidence coming in—if I may use an illustration from secular matters—like a declaratory Act of Parliament. The call of the Gentiles and the termination of the Jewish Dispensation is (obscurely)

<sup>1</sup> It was Exodus xxiii. 19.

contained in the Old Testament and in the discourses of Our Lord, but not obviously as to make the belief in that doctrine an essential part of the Jewish faith. This is a case, therefore, in which, on my view, miraculous evidence was requisite; and it was given.

'Then if any one chooses to cavil about what is or is not sufficiently "obvious"—a thing which admits of indefinite degrees—I will be content to refer him to the old books of Logic, in which he may amuse himself with the puzzles of the "Calvus" and the "Acervus."

'Your other remark I do not well understand. I almost think you must have been mixing up in your mind what I said with what you guessed me to be thinking of. If you will look again at the passage, you will see that I do not charge any one with holding the "double doctrine;" I only allude to the existence of it, as a thing notorious. If any one does not hold it, let him, if he will, disavow it, and I will not contradict him. But if any of those who do, justify themselves on the plea that though they do not set forth "all the counsel of God"—though they conceal, from such as they do not deem worthy, a part of the Christian religion, yet they do not teach anything that they do not believe—I do think it my duty, and yours, and every honest man's, to protest against such a plea. You may make anything out of anything, if you are allowed to suppress what parts of it you please. I have heard it remarked that the statuary does not make but only discloses his statue—that the Medicean Venus existed in the block of marble, and that the artist only removed the superfluous portion of the block. Now what should I think of a man's pleading that such an image is not contemplated in the Second Commandment because it is not "made," as if it had been moulded or cast out of materials brought together?

‘ I dare say you have seen—most ladies have it in their album—a copy of a supposed letter from a young married woman to her schoolfellow, submitted perforce to her husband’s inspection, and describing his merits and her happiness. She slipped in a P.S., “*read every other line,*” which done it appeared a reverse picture.’

The success of the Archbishop’s attempt to bring the evidences of our religion within the comprehension of the unlearned has been attested by the widespread circulation of the book in question, not only in English, but in most other modern languages ; but proofs more interesting and touching may be cited of its effect on individuals. Two instances have come before the writer’s knowledge of hardened infidels (both intelligent men of the artisan class) who have been convinced of the truth of Christianity and led to the study of the Scriptures, and ultimately, as it appeared, to receive the truth into their hearts, by the agency of this little book. One of these lived, laboured, and died as a missionary teacher in a foreign land ; the other did not long survive his conversion, but gave every evidence of its being a real one. These are but two isolated instances, out of many which will doubtless be known in the day when all secrets shall be revealed.

The following letter, to his friend Mr. Blanco White, is interesting, as showing the constant and generous concern for his welfare and comfort, which no differences of opinion could for a moment slacken :—

‘ Leamington : August 1837.

‘ My dear Blanco,—Remind Mrs. W., in case she should forget, of the books from Senior, which she is bringing you. He has been writing for a conveyance for them.

‘ And pray consult with her on the subject which I

treated on some time ago—the question of your fixing yourself in a warmer spot than where you are. Liverpool is not in point of latitude what one would fix on for a native of Spain peculiarly sensitive to cold, but I am led to believe it is a cold and damp atmosphere, even for its latitude. And it does seem to me you have suffered from it much that you might have had a chance of avoiding in Devon or Cornwall. Only do not wait to form any plans till the winter is just at hand, but think of it while the warm weather has some time to last.

‘And surely I need not say the trifling expense attending a removal, if otherwise desirable, is not worth a thought.’

At this time the Archbishop was also much engaged in an earnest endeavour to do away with the oaths administered by him, as Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick, to those who were installed.

His petition to the Queen,<sup>1</sup> will show his views in desiring this change, better than any explanation could do; and the letters which follow, to his chaplain and friend Dr. Dickinson, and to Earl (then Lord John) Russell, will further elucidate them:—

*To Dr. Dickinson.*

‘Leamington: August 10, 1837.

‘My dear D.,—I send by the Castle to-day the 7th lesson. You ought to have had the two preceding on Sunday, through the Irish Office, London, to which write, if not arrived. The enclosure reached London on Friday.

‘I am very well satisfied about the oath. It is just in that way that the penal laws, test acts, &c., were gradually got rid of.

‘Does Sir W. B. mean that “quis separabit” relates

<sup>1</sup> Post, p. 405.

to the legislative union, which was not the law at the time when the Order was founded? or to the non-deprivation of the King of any part of his dominions? In that case the oath of allegiance affords the requisite security in a more distinct form. Or if any further oath is needed, it should be taken by all Her Majesty's subjects. It is not merely the Knights of St. Patrick (thank Heaven!) who are bound to maintain the royal rights, or else they would be in a bad way.

‘Ever yours affectionately,

‘R. W.

‘N.B.—I myself am ever ready to vote for abolishing superfluous oaths, and this alone would oblige me not to lay myself open to the charge of continuing contentedly to administer any without asking to be relieved.’

*To the Lord John Russell.*

‘Dublin: August 28, 1837.

‘My dear Lord,—I am just arrived, and lose no time in acknowledging the favour of your lordship's letter, apprising me of Her Majesty's gracious compliance with my application, in reference to the oaths administered to the Knights of St. Patrick.

‘I wish your lordship to convey to Her Majesty, if you should see any occasion on which it would be suitable, the expression of my sincere gratitude for the condescending readiness with which my request has been listened to.

‘It is a source of additional gratification to me that the relief afforded has come not in the shape of a special dispensation to myself individually (which is all that I could myself presume to apply for), but in a mode which

seems more distinctly to recognise the reasonableness of the principle by which I have been actuated.

‘I have long since been accustomed, at Oxford, to lend my aid to those who have been labouring—and ultimately with considerable success—to get rid of the multitude of needless academical oaths. The ill-effects of these on the minds of the members of the University and on the whole character of academical bodies, I have for many years had ample opportunities of observing. I shall always be prepared to advocate in Parliament a corresponding course; but in so doing I might have been justly charged with inconsistency if I came forward to propose legislative measures for diminishing superfluous oaths, while at the same time I used no endeavours for diminishing those which could be dispensed with without any application to Parliament, and in which I was myself a party concerned.’ . . . .

The following *jeu d’esprit*—a letter composed of a string of proverbs—will be amusing to many, and illustrate his remarkable and characteristic love of, and extensive acquaintance with, these short and pithy sayings. He was fond of collecting and collating similar ones in different languages, and comparing their various peculiarities. The ‘Proverb Copies,’ which he published some years later, for the use of the National Schools, are highly characteristic of his mind in this respect:—

*Letter from the Archbishop of Dublin to a Lady who requested his opinion on the present state of Ireland.*

‘May 1837.

‘The occasion is now arrived when all who wish to deliver this country from its troubles and ward off its impending dangers ought to exert themselves, and, as

the proverb says, "Take time by the forelock." We may regret that so many opportunities have been already lost ; but, as the proverb says, "The miller cannot grind with the water that is past." If we would not be worse than fools, whom, as the proverb says, "experience teaches," we should consider how to avoid losing another opportunity, which may be the last, and then we shall repent it, since, as the proverb says, "Bien perdu bien connu." Standing still and waiting never did any good, for, as the proverb says, "Though the sun stood still, time never did." "To-morrow," as the proverb says, "comes never." It is in vain to wish that things were in a different state from what they are. "I never fared worse," as the proverb says, "than when I had a wish for my supper;" and it is no less to talk of what we would do if the case were different, for, as the proverb says, "If my aunt had been a man she would have been my uncle," and "if the sky should fall," as says the proverb, "we should catch larks." It is idle to look for a change of Ministers, and hope great things from a different party in power, for, as the proverb says, "To a leaky ship all winds are contrary;" and it is more idle to waste our spirits in anger against another's fault, for, as the proverb says, "There are two kinds of things a man should never get angry at—what he cannot help, and what he can." A wise man will never be driven desperate, and, as the proverb says, "throw the horse away after the saddle." But if we do exert ourselves to help the Church and the nation, others who are now lost in apathy may follow the example, for, as the proverb says, "Two dry sticks will kindle a green one." This is much better than fretting ourselves with grief and indignation, since, as the proverb says, "What is the use of patience if we cannot find it when we want it?"—"He who gives way to anger punishes himself for

the fault of another." The state of things is now such as calls for a fundamental and permanent remedy that shall remove the cause of existing evils. To look merely for a palliation of each evil as it arrives is, as the proverb says, "To work at the pump and to leave the leak open." If we leave things alone we shall find them indeed, as the proverb says, "like sour ale in summer;" and to grudge any sacrifice, inconvenience, or trouble, for a greater and more lasting advantage, is to be, as the proverb says, "Penny wise and pound foolish." "No pains no gains," as the proverb says, and again, as the proverb says, "If you will not take pains, pains will take you." "We had better," as the proverb says, "wear out shoes than sheets." We must not be merely satisfied with pleading rights which we cannot defend, when, as the proverb says, "Might overcomes right." "No man can live on an income of which he gets," as the proverb says, "no pence in the pound." Besides, we should remember that, as the proverb says, "He buys honey too dear who licks it off thorns." It is indeed not to be wondered at that those who have suffered much should easily be alarmed, and always, as the proverb says, "misgive that they may not mistake." But they should guard against imaginary dangers, as "The scalded cat," says the proverb, "fears cold water," and "He that is bitten by a serpent," as the proverb says, "is afraid of a rope." But, as the proverb says, "To run away is to run a risk." I do not mean that anything can be proposed which is not open to objection. "A fool," as the proverb says, "can easily find faults which a wise man cannot easily mend." But the question is to find out what course is open to the least objection, for we should remember, as the proverb says, "Half a loaf is better than no bread," and again, as the proverb says, "A man with a wooden leg goes the better

for it." We must not seek for the best thing we could imagine, but for the best that is practicable, and, as the proverb says, "Drive the nail that will go." "If we cannot alter the wind," as the proverb says, "we must turn the mill sails." We have found by experience what can be expected from those who express great regard for us. Many of them are, as the proverb says, "Good friends at a sneeze; one can get nothing but God bless you!" and some of them have given us good reason to say, according to the proverb, "Save me from my friends—I care not for my enemies." Some of them are, as the proverb says, "As honest as any man in the cards when the kings are out." It is time, therefore, that we look with less distrust towards those who do not make such high professions, for, as the proverb says, "An ass that will carry me is better than a horse that will throw me," and again, as the proverb says, "Better an ass that speaks right than a prophet that speaks wrong." And if we will not learn this in time, we shall find, as the proverb says, "As we brew so must we bake." But though all this, to me, seems very much to the purpose, you will, perhaps, think it tedious and vapid, because, as the proverb says, "Wise men make proverbs, and fools repeat them." Remember however that, as the proverb says, "Though fools learn nothing from wise men, wise men learn much from fools."

It was in this year (1837) that Dr. Whately's special efforts for the abolition of transportation, in connection with Sir William Molesworth's Committee of Inquiry, were commenced. This committee had sprung from one formed in 1835, for the purpose of examining into the state of the colonies, and clearing them from abuses. The Archbishop of Dublin's interest in the subject being well known, his co-

operation was earnestly sought. His views and opinions on many subjects differed widely from those of several of the leading members of this committee, but he always felt it right to unite in the furtherance of a common object with any who would work with him, however widely their opinions might differ on other points. His brother-in-law, the Rev. Henry Bishop, was examined in this year before the committee, and in the following year the Archbishop's letter to him was published in the Minutes of Evidence of the Select Committee on Transportation.

It was about this period also that the movement at Oxford which commenced with the violent opposition to Dr. Hampden's appointment as Bampton Lecturer, in 1834, and subsequently became identified with what is now called 'Tractarianism,' was in full force. Some remarks which the Archbishop frequently made in conversation, respecting this movement, will explain, better than any notices by another would, the manner in which he viewed this celebrated movement:—

*Table Talk.—On Tractarianism.*

“ ‘The Pastoral Epistle’ (by Dr. Dickinson) was reviled as unjust, and derided as absurd, for pointing out and foretelling just what afterwards came to pass; and yet, what is still stranger, we are looked down upon even now as only half enlightened, by people who congratulate themselves on not having gone the whole length of the Tracts—*only* the first two volumes, which are the very ones from which he drew his prophecy; and these gifted individuals, who could not see their tendency even when pointed out, nor understand the grounds of the prophecy even after it is fulfilled, hug themselves with the thought that they never cultivated stinging-nettles, only the nettle-roots.

‘He perceived, with me, that the Hampden persecution was the first outbreak of Tractism, and its success the great strengthener of the party. The combustibles were ready indeed, and some other spark, if not that, would have kindled them; but the support the party received at the time of that persecution, from those who did not really belong to them, but opposed Hampden from political or other motives, gave them a great lift.

‘In Hampden’s case, it must be owned I did not anticipate any outbreak so monstrous as did ensue, and, what is more, if I had remained head of Alban Hall it would never have taken place. This is quite certain, for my successor was one of the most violent of the persecutors, and the measure passed the Board of Heads by *one* vote. But most of my Oxford friends have assured me that the thing would not even have been attempted; that those disposed to it would have shrunk from encountering the exposure they would have had to expect at the Hebdomadal Board; and that those who were led away would have found the better suggestions of their minds fortified.

‘It is thus that, as many of my friends assure me, I exercised a considerable influence at Oxford—not great on any one individual, but a little on a great number. Certain it is, at least, whether accidentally or not, that Oxford is a widely different place, and has long been so, from what it was while I resided there. There have been, perhaps, other persecutions as unjust and as cruel (none *more* so if we take into account the times and circumstances of each; for burning of heretics is unsuited to the present age, and moreover was not in the power of the Hampden persecutors; they did all that they could and dared, and so did Bonner), but for impudence I never knew the like. To find out, three years after the Bamp-

ton Lectures had been delivered, and two years after they had been published, that they were dangerously heterodox, though they had passed at the time not only unanswered, but with high applause! There never was a more lame and palpably false pretence so shamefully brought forward.

‘I used often to remark, while it was going on, that the instances continually displayed in it of combined folly, cruelty, and baseness were startling even to one who, like me, had not anticipated much greatness or goodness from human nature. But there is no telling, when a pond seems clear, how much mud there may be at the bottom till you stir it up.’

The following letter shows his lively interest in plans of colonisation :—

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

‘Dublin : November 8, 1837 (Saturday night).

‘Hinds has written to me, and sent me a book about a proposed colonisation of New Zealand, and I think he either had applied or meant to apply to you. Pray take an opportunity of asking Stephen<sup>1</sup> whether he has heard of the plan, which I think he must, from Lieutenant Gray.

‘The country certainly seems to have many advantages ; and as for the act of colonising, if anything is to be learned from past errors, we have no want of instructions.

‘By-the-bye, what a pity it is, and yet the evil is un-

<sup>1</sup> Under-Secretary for the Colonies. Several publications appeared, in this and the following years, respecting that plan of colonisation which was ultimately carried into partial execution by the New Zealand Company, established in 1841.

avoidable, that in so many cases (as that in the suppressed evidence) the public are led to false results by the *suppressio veri*, &c. The only thing to be done is to give a very strong declaration of the horrible character of what is suppressed. But this is very insufficient, when on the one side you have “details,” and on the other merely “totum.” The horrors of one campaign—of one capture of a city, if detailed, would create such a horror of war as nothing else could, and such as the reality justifies. This cannot be done. But, then, the worst of it is, all the brilliant parts of the war *are* discussed—the skill and valour displayed, the enterprise and excitement, everything that can render war attractive; we have a full display, as it were, of the beautiful head and bosom of Milton’s “Sin,” while a decent veil is thrown over the monsters that spring from her waist. It is a pity that we should thus whiten the sepulchre! If I had received your letter in time to-day, I would have answered it by return, that you might have had something to show Lord Lansdowne. I hope you showed him the letter to Bowood. You do not say what instructions Sir G. Gipps takes out to New South Wales.’

The alterations in the Poor-law were now pending, and the design of the Government, of adapting the English law to Ireland, was occupying the minds of the Archbishop and Mr. Senior.

\*By way of introduction to the large portion of his correspondence which relates to this subject, thus much may be prefixed. Archbishop Whately, in combination with his brother the Reverend Thomas Whately, Vicar of Cookham, and his friend Mr. Senior, had early directed no small portion of his energy and abilities towards the reform of the English Poor-law. The views which he entertained on

this subject were well known, and exposed him in his day to no common share of unpopularity with some classes of his fellow-countrymen. He had early persuaded himself of the evils both of indiscriminate charity and of legal provision for the able-bodied poor. With his masculine, unwavering tendency to follow out principles which he deemed the correct ones, he never turned to the right or to the left in his deliberate exertions to arm men's minds against yielding to those weaknesses which in his belief had engendered both. He, whose whole life was a series of acts of charity and liberality, passed, and from a strong sense of duty purposely allowed himself to pass, as the apostle of a hard doctrine, which few minds have the vigour to embrace, and still fewer to avow. When he came to Ireland, the English reform had as yet hardly begun to operate; and he threw the whole weight of his authority and arguments on the side of those who opposed the introduction of Poor-laws into Ireland.

In order to enable the reader to follow the Archbishop in much of the next part of his correspondence, it is to be remembered that the subject of a Poor-law for Ireland, then entirely without such an institution, was opened by Michael T. Sadler in 1832, and continued from that time largely to occupy the minds of public men and writers. 'There was no subject,' says Miss Martineau, in her 'History of England during the Peace,' 'on which O'Connell vacillated more than this; and there can be no doubt his vacillation was real.' And the great power which he then exercised in Ireland rendered his co-operation almost necessary. He opposed it, however, up to 1836; in that year, the disclosures made by the 'Board of Inquiry,' of the utter destitution of so large a mass of the Irish people, seem to have affected his resolution.

In August of that year, Mr. (since Sir George) Nicholls, Commissioner of English Poor-law, was sent on a tour of inspection. After an inquiry of little more than six weeks, he prepared a report (often alluded to in these letters), which facilitated the introduction of the new law for the establishment of a system of national relief. It passed in July 1838. The terrible catastrophe of 1847 so completely and permanently altered the economical state of things in Ireland, that it is almost an obsolete inquiry whether the Archbishop was or was not right in his opposition to the original measure.\*

Many subsequent letters are on this subject:—

‘ Dublin : Nov. 13, 1837.

‘ My dear Senior,—I am much alarmed by what you say of the approbation likely to be felt of the “ simplicity and practicability ” of Mr. ——’s schemes, as contrasted with the complexity and onerous machinery of those of the Commissioners.

‘ It is, unhappily, but too probable that many of our legislators may fail to perceive that this can only arise from his having overlooked most of the difficulties, and left many dangers unguarded against. Nothing can exceed the simplicity (even in the most complex and difficult matters) of bad legislation, except, perhaps, the *simplicity* of those who admire it. In barbarous nations government is a very simple matter ; it is usually a simple despotism, and the despot appoints a *cadi* or *pasha* to judge all causes that may arise, and decide at his own discretion ; just as Mr. ——’s English Commissioners are, with a very imperfect knowledge of what is going on in Ireland, to transmit directions, at their discretion, to persons in Ireland, who neither would if they could, nor could if they would, execute them. The nice and knotty

points of chancery, or common-law, which it requires years to study, interfere with the simplicity of Persian or Tartarian government. We are a little advanced from this, and perhaps some time or other may become, in this respect, worthy of the name of civilised ; but at present the exclamation is still applicable to us, "How long, ye simple ones, will ye love simplicity?" Nothing is more simple than the mode in which a butcher would amputate a limb : instead of a complex apparatus of lancets and other instruments, and a tedious process of taking up the skin and tying the arteries, he would chop off the limb with a cleaver, and leave the patient to die of hemorrhage or of mortification.

*Which* would be the fate of Ireland under the proposed law, I cannot be sure ; there is a provision for letting blood, but none that I know of for stopping it. So also an engineer is for years studying the art of fortification, and months in fortifying a town ; while a common mason would go to work in a simple mode, by building, without any complex zigzags, a plain stone wall ; it would be finished in a few weeks, and battered down in half an hour. The simplicity of Mr. Nicholls' plan consists, in fact, in making *no* legislative provisions for any of the numerous important and difficult details, but devolving the whole task of making laws (only that they are to be called "rules") on the Commissioners. When the result turns out, as it undoubtedly will, to be a failure in all the good effects promised, and productive of enormous mischiefs, the Legislature will throw the blame on the English Commissioners, and they again on the Irish Guardians ; when, in fact, the Legislature itself is the party to be blamed. But the fallacy which misleads men in such a case, is, that they see the necessity of leaving large discretionary powers to men who (as in the

case of the English Poor-laws) have a variety of minute details to manage; and forget that this can then only be safely and wisely done when the general track is completely marked out, and leads to a point which we are sure can be reached. The difference, in short, between the discretion vested in the Commissioners of the English Poor-laws, and that proposed for the Irish (and it is, I conceive, the confounding of these two together that has all along so bewildered Mr. ——) is just this: if I send him out on a voyage to Calcutta, I should not think of prescribing what sails he should set, or what precise track he should pursue each day of the voyage, but leave him to his own discretion, in reference to the winds and currents; but this would be quite different from sending him out to discover the North Pole, and to use his own discretion how to get there. Notwithstanding, however, all that you say of the difficulty of resisting popular clamour in this case, I am not without hopes that that clamour may partly abate, and partly become more rational, in proportion as people become, as they are daily becoming, more enlightened on the subject, by bestowing more thought upon it.<sup>1</sup> . . . .

‘Ever yours,

‘R. W.’

‘Tuesday, Nov. 14, 1837.

‘My dear Senior,—There is one thing in Revans’ pamphlet<sup>2</sup> which I wonder has not attracted so much attention as it deserves; in which he shows the cloven-

<sup>1</sup> The remainder of this letter is omitted, as bearing on what may be called the temporary part of the subject—the Archbishop’s fears and hopes as to the state of opinion in Parliament respecting the dreaded introduction of the workhouse system in Ireland.

<sup>2</sup> ‘On the Evils of the State of Ireland.’

foot, *i.e.* gives a hint of his real (revolutionary) principles. In the titlepage we see the remedy, "A Poor Law, price Half a Crown" (not 2/6).

'I quite agree with him—not in wishing, but in anticipating, from such a measure as he proposes, a dissolution of the union, a civil war, and a final loss of half the crown; and I may add that, since the relief of the impotent must, alone, be a heavy expense, and since, therefore, common prudence dictates that we should first try how the country can bear that burden, before we impose an additional one, it is evident that those who insist on trying both experiments together, and both immediately instead of one at a time, and the milder one first, will justly be suspected of advocating what they know or believe to be a revolutionary measure, whose mischievous tendency they suspect men would perceive if they had time for a calm inquiry and reflection, and which, therefore, must be hurried through with headlong haste, that a step may be at once taken which cannot afterwards be retraced. But all (who have no evil intentions) will agree, whatever they may think of a provision for the ablebodied, in approving of some relief for the impotent, and cannot at least object to the making of this a separate and a preliminary measure.

'I cannot conceive how any one can venture to object to this course, without avowing that his object is to remedy our evils at the price of half a crown.'

*To the same.*

'Dublin: Tuesday, Nov. 22, 1837.

'There is a strong temptation—and it is best to warn a friend against any temptation before you perceive him to have once decidedly yielded to it—there is a strong

temptation, to persons in public life, to this sort of cheat-the-devil procedure, when one may forward some end one has in view by saying what is literally true, and no more, when you know that the suppression of something else will be likely to leave a false impression ; and when, by simply holding one's peace, one may gain the favour or escape the enmity of some one in power, who finds it convenient to his purpose to put forth *half* of what one has said, and conceal the other half.

‘ Now I am about it, I will also suggest to you that there is a friend of yours, whom you justly admire for his talents and agreeable qualities, and who certainly is not to be reckoned a man of bad principles, and whose example is the more liable to draw off a man gradually from straightforwardness, from the circumstance that there is one point of simplicity about him—viz., his avowal, and indeed display, of the shifts and contrivances by which he manages to reconcile to his conscience pious frauds of various kinds. It seems to me that he is so amused with his own ingenuity as to prefer having sympathy with that amusement, and admiration for that ingenuity, to the attainment of the highest point of art—*celare artem*. He reminds me of a knight at chess, which always goes one step straight, and one oblique, and never can have his course blocked up so as to prevent his moving. Now a complete hypocrite does not set an example of hypocrisy, but of the frankness and openness which he seems to possess. A book of Jesuitical casuistry, or a Jewish Mishna, are much more seductive.’

‘ Dublin : Tuesday.

‘ My dear Senior,—I apprehend R. wishes *μάλιστα μὲν* to be secretary to the Central Board that will probably be established *here* ; *εἰ δὲ μὴ* the English appointment. I agree

with you that he is like fire; and he is a fire harder now than formerly to be kept within bounds. He would therefore probably produce in England partial damage, and here universal ruin. So that I do not know what is to be done, considering his claims to remuneration, which in these days of *economy* can only be made by putting a man into some *office*. Extremes meet. If Caligula lived now, he would find himself *forced* to make his horse consul, as the only way in which he could provide him an extra feed of corn.

‘I did not mean to decide the question *generally* about rent and profit. But in a popular elementary treatise I felt sure I could not draw so nice a distinction clearly enough to be properly understood. For, 1st, the word rent must be established in a technical sense, so as to exclude rent of *houses*, &c.; 2ndly, it must be separated, even in your case of land, from that which usually forms the greater part of that actually paid, the profits on the capital inseparably united with the land on which it has been laid out. The adjustment of terms to a scientific system, when they have been long unscientifically used, is one of the great difficulties in making our science popular. And, moreover, the purchase of a natural agent is in practice regarded, and is equivalent to, an *investment* of *capital*. A, B, C inherit 10,000*l.* apiece; A buys an estate, B invests in the funds, and C in a cotton-mill: A is said to live on the *rent* of his land, B on the *interest*, C. on the *profit*; but all three are said to have invested their respective *capitals*.’

‘Saturday.

‘My dear Senior,—I enclose a letter from Lady Barry, and my answer to it, which says that it would not be proper for me to take any part in a publication on such a

subject, while I am chairman ; but that if she will put it into your hands, you, or somebody you will commit the office to, will give an opinion as to its being published or suppressed. The fact is, it is the sort of thing that may conceivably do great good or great harm.

‘ This is a momentous question, and as regards (besides other matters) our Commission, all *your* labours in *England* will have been of no avail, if rash measures are adopted with respect to Ireland. For the dead corpse will poison the living body ; in fact, if such a system of providing food and employment at the public expense (*i.e.* of the empire) for all who want it in Ireland, as some advocate, be adopted, I, for one, shall have nothing to say against repeal. It will be steering away from a ship on fire. By the help of Wrightson and Blake I hope we may avoid such extremities. Can you not write something in the “Globe” to help our cause?’

‘Dublin : Monday.

‘My dear Senior,—Yours received on Saturday. I have been writing to Lord Morpeth, at his desire, the substance of a conversation with him on the plan I mentioned in my last ; and I have entered further into the calculations, and referred to the report (Committee on Irish Church Property, 1832), which recognises one of the main principles—the buying-up of tithes. I propose to buy up even what may be called suppressed tithe—*i.e.*, to regard the tithes of tithe-free land as the property of the landowners, and buy them along with the rest, in order to avoid troublesome distinctions in the imposing of any land-tax which might be substituted. The composition being valued on the estimate of that report at sixteen years’ purchase (usually fetching but fifteen), and the sum

paid for them<sup>1</sup> being raised by sale of government annuities, at perhaps thirty years, there would accrue a gain of from 300,000*l.* to 400,000*l.* per annum to Government—a far greater surplus than what was lately the bone of contention, yet leaving the Church at least as well off as under Sir R. Peel's bill. It would be a vast gain to do away a point of difference between men, who have many of them no *other* reason against acting together, by giving each party even better terms than were sought. And I know not how it can be expected that either “goat should lie down;” or that the government of the empire can go on without some adjustment between parties so nearly balanced.

‘So strong is the prevailing sense of the difficulty, that some expect *no* tithe-bill at all will be proposed, and that Ministers will be satisfied to retain office without even an attempt to embody in a law the principle on the successful maintenance of which they came in. I mention this only to show what a stale-mate it is thought we are come to.’

The contemplated introduction of the Irish Poor-law still occupied the Archbishop's mind most painfully. All his efforts to bring English legislators to understand the true state of the case in Ireland, according to his view of it, were unavailing.

‘Those with whom I attempted to argue on the subject,’ he would remark, ‘used to say that “something must be done for Ireland,” and something, therefore, be it good or bad, they resolved should be done. —— remarked to me, when the Outdoor Relief Bill was passing, that the feeling of the English was a mixture of revenge, compassion, and self-love. They pitied the suffering poor of Ireland; they had a fierce resentment against Irish land-

<sup>1</sup> Sic.

lords, whom they hastily judged to be the sole authors of those sufferings; and they dreaded calls on their own purse. When men decide and act under the strong influence of passion, especially *three* passions at once, they are usually not very wise in their measures.

‘It was much like Swift’s recommendation,’ he would add, ‘to the lady’s-maid, when sent to open a drawer or box, and unable to find the right key; she is to force one of them into the lock, and wrench till she either opens the drawer or breaks the key: “for your mistress will think you a fool if you come back and have done nothing!” And such a mistress did the Commissioners find the British public.’

The recommendations of the Archbishop and his colleagues were—to take, at all events, no step of irretrievable risk; to proceed gradually, and be content rather to leave some evils unremedied for the present, than produce other and greater ones by rashness; and to *begin*, at least, by conferring such benefits, however small, as they could be reasonably sure would be such—as institutions for the blind, deaf and dumb, &c. But no: ‘something must be *done* for Ireland,’ and ‘there is no making it *worse* than it is,’ were the cry of England; and the Archbishop frequently observed, that many in England were really under the impression that it would be desirable to take such measures as might prevent the periodical immigration of Irish labourers to England for the harvest-work, ‘to take the bread out of the mouths of the English labourers,’ and ‘to carry away with them English money into Ireland’—as if it were not plain that if the work they did were not worth more than that money, it would not be worth any one’s while to employ them.

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

‘Palace : September 21, 1837.

‘What I would suggest relative to Poor-laws is, that you should avail yourself of this opportunity to come over here and see a little for yourself. I do not mean that you should in two or three weeks pretend to be a better judge of the actual state of things than those who have spent years here, and then go home and write a “*report stating that no reports are to be relied on,*” and that actual inspection is necessary; but there are some things worth seeing.

‘I have sent Bishop, for your use, a copy of a letter to Lord J. Russell on Transportation, on which, as well as on Irish tithes (not on poor-laws), he had consulted me. Bishop will forward it or keep it, as you may desire. It is curious that this unlooked-for communication from Lord J. R. came along with an announcement that the Queen had acceded to my request about the oaths most fully, having substituted a declaration for an oath, I believe, in all the orders.’

‘Dublin : Oct 31, 1837.

‘My dear Senior,—I wonder who is the writer of an able article in the “*Edinburgh Review,*” just out, on Irish Poor-laws. I should think it would be worth while for our Legislature to consult with him personally. I am very glad of the article appearing just now, and not the less that the writer is a severe, and (as is natural for me to think) an unfair critic of some parts of our reports.

‘This takes away the suspicion of partiality towards our views, which exists so much against ourselves. For it seems to have been very commonly taken for granted, that we approved of certain measures because they had

been recommended by ourselves, instead of our recommending them because we approved them; and that we disapprove of the workhouse system because it is rejected in our report, instead of our rejecting it because we disapproved it.

‘It will often happen, indeed, that vaccination or some *new* medicine or mode of treatment is disapproved of at first by the most eminent practitioners, because not discovered by themselves. But in the present case we *had* heard of such a thing as a workhouse.

‘I have often observed, however, that those who labour for the public, unpaid, are supposed to have some favourite hobby that they wish to ride, or some secret scheme to further; while there is a strong sympathy with those who have an avowed and obvious personal interest. Thus, there was in many minds a stronger feeling in favour of one of our education inspectors, who was most deservedly dismissed, than in favour of the Commissioners, who had been doing and bearing so much gratuitously. It seemed to be the habitual feeling of many not in the ranks of the adversaries, that the Irish Education was a sort of favourite scheme of our own, and that the Houses of Parliament were entitled to our gratitude for giving any share of their attention to it, and for not absolutely condemning us unheard.

Another reason why the Poor-law Inquiry Commissioners are listened to with so much prejudice, may perhaps be, that persons who have paid but little attention to such a subject are apt to hope for all that they wish, and for much more than is possible, and thence to be dissatisfied with those who have examined too carefully to be misled by false expectations, and who are too honest to promise what they know cannot be performed. To all this must be added a hasty application of the example

of England, whose situation has been so much improved by the reformed Poor-law that many are apt to forget how far that situation is from what is absolutely desirable, though it is so in comparison of the former state. A man who has scrambled halfway out of the slough is in the same place indeed, but not in the same situation, with one who has fallen halfway into it, especially if he be one who, like Ireland, has “an alacrity in sinking.” Mr. Barrington has drawn up a report of his “Mont de Piété,” which seems to have answered admirably in Limerick, and which he wants to try in Dublin. What think you ?’

The following petition to the Queen is on a subject mentioned before, that of the oaths administered by the Chancellor of the Order of St. Patrick :—

‘ *To the Queen’s Most Excellent Majesty.*

‘ May it please your Majesty,

‘ I presume to approach your Majesty, in a strong hope that the conscientious scruples of any of your Majesty’s subjects will be considered not undeserving of your royal notice, and that your Majesty’s favour will be graciously extended to the relief of any one of them from whatever may be felt as a grievance, where such relief can be afforded with no detriment or inconvenience to others.

‘ The case which I beg permission humbly to submit to your Majesty’s consideration, is the following :—

‘ As Archbishop of Dublin, I am officially Chancellor of the most illustrious Order of St. Patrick, and in that capacity am called on to administer, from time to time, the oath to those created knights.

‘This oath (of which I enclose a copy) is merely a matter of form, and not intended or felt as imposing any restriction or duty which the candidate might have been likely otherwise to neglect. It is, in fact, merely a part of the ceremonial, designed for the increase of the antique splendour and dignity of the order, and of all that is connected with it.

‘Now, the scruple I feel in respect of oaths of this kind turns on this very circumstance. It seems to be admitted by most Christians that oaths are then only justifiable, and exempt from the charge of profaneness, when called for by necessity, and (as the 39th Article of the Church expresses it) “in a cause of faith and charity,” and that all others must come under the description (in the same Article) of “vain and rash swearing.”

‘I have not only subscribed that Article according to the above interpretation, but, in common with the rest of the clergy, I have been accustomed thus to explain and inculcate the duty which it appears to me to convey, and which I conceive to be also implied in the proclamations issued by your Majesty and your illustrious predecessors. The thoughtless and unpremeditated manner in which some persons introduce the most Holy Name in familiar conversation, however insufficient as an excuse, is at least no aggravation of their fault, as compared with a deliberate use of that Name uncalled for by any important object.

‘My humble request, therefore, to your Majesty is, that by virtue of the supreme authority unquestionably vested in the Sovereign of the Order, your Majesty may be pleased to dispense with the oath above referred to.

‘I beg leave to submit that a similar dispensing power has been exercised from time to time in matters more important in reference to the institution, as being more

calculated to strike the public eye, and adding to the solemn splendour of the ceremonial—such as the procession to St. Patrick's Cathedral, and occasionally even the wearing of the mantle at the time of investiture.

‘It has appeared to me that the occasion most suitable for laying before your Majesty such an application as this, and the least inconvenient for the discontinuance, should your Majesty deem it advisable, of an ancient practice, is at the auspicious commencement of a new reign, before any candidate has been actually admitted of the order.

‘Permit me to subscribe myself, with the most profound respect, Madam, your Majesty's most devoted and most dutiful subject,

‘RICHARD DUBLIN.’

## CHAPTER XII.

1838.

Letter to Dr. Arnold on the London University—Letter to Mr. Senior on colonising New Zealand, &c.—Letter on various subjects—His practice regarding anonymous letters—Revisits Oxford—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Letter to Mr. Senior on Irish Education—Misrepresentations from the Stationery Office and others respecting the Education Board.

THE first letter of this year which comes before us is in answer to some questions of Dr. Arnold,<sup>1</sup> on the subject of the then newly-founded London University:—

‘Dublin : January 5, 1838.

‘My dear Arnold,—The best way, perhaps, in which I can throw light on the questions you refer to me, will be by adverting to some matters which have come under my own experience, especially when that experience has been counter to my previous expectations.

‘Six years ago, or more, I should have been rather inclined to doubt the possibility of having any instruction or any examinations in Christian Scriptures, that all various denominations might peaceably partake of.

‘When Lord Stanley formed the Education Board he had no such thought. And when first Mr. Carlisle proposed drawing up Scripture Extracts, I partook of the same expectations with Bishop Phillpotts, that no selections could be introduced, with the concurrence of all parties,

<sup>1</sup> It is the only letter to Dr. Arnold which has been preserved.

such as should be of any utility. But I was as willing to have the experiment tried as he was anxious to prevent it, and as much rejoiced as he was mortified and provoked at the unexpected success. I do not even now think my apprehensions groundless. The obstacles were incomparably greater than those to any analogous plan in England.<sup>1</sup>

‘The Roman Catholics do not, like the Dissenters, use the same version of the Bible as the Churchmen; they do not permit the free and indiscriminate use of Scripture; they do not make Scripture their sole standard of faith; they do not appeal to the authorised version, or the Greek original, as their standard of Scripture, but to the Vulgate; and they had been recently engaged in controversies with the Kildare Place Society on those very questions. Moreover, large and fierce mutual persecutions had embittered the two parties against each other; and most of the Protestant clergy and many of the laity made it their study to excite dissensions relative to our schools. And lastly, a large proportion of the priests, being themselves very slightly acquainted with Scripture, could not be expected to look with a favourable eye on the study of any part of it by their flocks. My apprehensions therefore were, I still think, quite reasonable. The result, however, was complete success. All the effort to raise jealousy in reference to the Scripture Extracts have, within the schools themselves, totally failed.

‘They are read with delight and profit by almost all the children; and I and other Protestants, as Bishop Stanley knows, have examined the children of all denominations,

<sup>1</sup> In connection with this subject, it may be observed that it was in 1837 that the Archbishop produced the celebrated tract ‘Easy Lessons on Christian Evidences,’ afterwards admitted into the mixed schools by Dr. Murray, and finally objected to by Dr. Cullen in 1853.

without knowing to which each child belonged, raising no jealousy, and finding them better taught in Scripture than most gentlefolks' children. Of course Mr. Spring-Rice will remark, when this is laid before him (which he already knows), that, first, I was prepared to go on with the system, even if no Scripture Extracts had been received; and secondly, that the use of them is only recommended, not enforced. This is quite true; and I am glad that in the few schools—they are but very few—where no Scripture is read, the children at least learn to read, write, and cipher.

‘And I would not scruple to have certificates made out, if any were required in such cases, that such-and-such a boy had been diligent and orderly, had read such-and-such books, and passed an examination in arithmetic. But I would not grant a certificate that the boy had gone through a course of education suitable to his station; that would imply that I considered a knowledge of the very first outlines of Christian History as improper or superfluous for a peasant. If any one said, “He is free to receive that knowledge from his priest,” I should answer, “Very well: I do not declare that he has not received a competent education, or that he might not if he would; but I cannot certify that he has. I can only certify, if you please, that I do not know to the contrary, and that he has been left to take his chance.” Now, to a child brought up in our model school, or in one similar to it, I could grant a certificate (analogous to a degree), stating that he had received a regular course of instruction, sufficient to qualify him to be generally a member of society in a Christian country, with reference to his station in life—not, indeed, instruction in the peculiarities of any particular church, or in the professional points of any particular trade, but in that which every one (of

whatever sect, and of whatever occupation) ought to be acquainted with in common, in order to deserve the title of decently educated.

‘But had the plan gone no further than Lord Stanley at first proposed and expected, I should not have considered it as furnishing education, but only a portion of education ; and I should have been glad to furnish even a small part of that portion, if no more could have been admitted. If there had been a scruple against teaching anything beyond the alphabet, I should have been glad to have even that taught.

‘From what I have actually done and thought and seen, you may pretty well conjecture how I should be likely to act in respect of the London University. In the first place, I should point out, first, from the experience of a far, very far more difficult trial, the perfect feasibility of having the historical books of the Bible as a portion of the studies and examinations ; and secondly, the importance of this as a portion of general education, on the ground that Christianity is the prevailing religious profession of the country. I should call for no signing of articles—no profession of faith ; but I should point out that in those portions of the empire where the Mahometan religion prevails, it is essential that those who are to reside among the Mussulmans and hold official situations should have some acquaintance with the Koran.

‘To say that a man can have gone through a course of liberal education in this country, totally ignorant of the outlines of Christian History, is to imply not merely that the Christian religion is untrue or bad, but that it is insignificant and unworthy of serious attention, except from those who have a fancy for it—as is the case with the mythological antiquities of the Anglo-Saxons, or the dreams of astrology and alchemy. And if any one

should say, "You need not doubt that the students do acquire this knowledge in other ways," I should say, "Very well; I do not say to the contrary. I will certify, if you please, that they may, for aught I know, have gone through a suitable and complete course of education; but I will not certify, by conferring anything in the nature of a degree, that they have done so, unless they shall have given proof before the University, as such, that they have." But if I was answered that the conductors of the University despaired of the possibility of conducting any examinations or lectures on the Greek Testament, so as to avoid jealousies and contests, I should consent to obtain what benefit we could—reckoning even half a loaf, or half a quarter of a loaf, better than no bread. But nothing would ever induce me to call it a whole loaf.

If objections are raised to examinations in History—and it would be very easy so to conduct these, or so to represent the conduct of them, as to raise religious objections and jealousies—and if similar scruples extended to everything except Euclid and Chemistry, I should say, "Then let Euclid and Chemistry be taught, and let a student have a certificate of having attended these lectures and passed an examination in them; but let not this certificate be confounded with a degree, or with anything certifying that the student had gone through what was, in the opinion of the Governors of the Institution, a sufficient course of liberal instruction." For if such a certificate related partly to instruction, supposed to have been received at home, which the Governors of the Institution did conceive to be essential, but which they did not themselves either supply or ascertain, then they might inwardly believe, but would have no right to certify publicly, the completeness of the education; if, again, they did reckon the course of instruction given within the Institution to be complete, they would

be right in certifying that they thought so ; but I should have no right to express a concurrence in their views. Many, I believe, would be scandalised at the ground on which I contend for a knowledge of Christian History as an essential part of a course of liberal education—viz., not the ground of its truth, but of its important place in society. But I am taking the only ground on which I conceive it can be with justice in any manner required. It has been the common practice for ages, in most States of Christendom, to require a profession of belief, but not knowledge. A man was required to profess himself a Christian Trinitarian—an Anti-Transubstantiationist—a Nicean, &c. ; but he might, if he pleased, remain ignorant whether Christ came before or after Mahomet—was born in Asia or Europe—was descended from David or from Nebuchadnezzar. My views are quite the reverse of these ; and, whether right or wrong, they are most deliberate and well-weighed.

‘ Ever yours affectionately,

‘ R. WHATELY.’

The subject of Colonisation was one in which the Archbishop had always taken a lively interest. He was often accustomed to revert to the wiser and sounder principles on which the ancient colonies were founded, their plans being systematically carried out, not left to chance ; the colony being allowed liberty of self-government, and encouraged to become independent, while the tie of attachment to the mother-country was never wholly effaced. It was with close attention, therefore, that he watched the formation at this time of the then new colony of New Zealand ; and the letter which follows, and some others which occur later, are mainly on this subject :—

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

‘January 25, 1838.

‘My dear Senior,—I learn from Hinds that you have seen the little publication about New Zealand, and are disposed to think favourably of the plan. Considering its proximity to New Holland, and its manifold superiority, I think a colony there might deserve to be called New Byzantium, as being (according to the ancient oracle) placed “opposite to the city of blind men.”

‘The Macedonians, however, and all other blind men are far outdone by the constitution at least of our abominable penal colonies.

‘I quite agree with Hinds as to the importance of appointing a bishop for the new colony. If this be not done, there must be either no episcopal church there, or else a connection with the Bishop of New South Wales. Both of these, I think, would be great evils, and the latter the greater of the two. I should much deprecate any shadow even of a connection with New South Wales. And I think the idea is now nearly done away, that the Church is more degraded by having a bishop without a coach-and-six than by having one too distant to be a real “overseer.”

‘What a curious Acteon-like fate would it be if O’Connell were to be murdered by a mob! He has been in no small danger. In his speeches on Poor-laws, and much more against the combinators, he has shown his usual skill, but a courage which he certainly never displayed before. I shall be glad to hear of the arrival of a parcel sent you about a fortnight since by a Government frank—a review by Willis of the expedition to New Holland.

‘There has been published in Dublin a pamphlet of extracts from my works, as a mode in which the com-

pilgrimages to let those who cannot wade through many volumes, judge for themselves of the truth of the charges against me. It is producing very considerable effect, being by no means ill-done. The compiler I have lately learnt to be a man with whom I had a very slight acquaintance.

‘We are all pretty well; Edward gaining ground better than in this severe weather could have been hoped.

‘Ever yours,

‘R. WHATELY.’

The letters which follow explain themselves:—

*To the Bishop of Norwich.*

‘Dublin: August 20, 1838.

‘My dear Lord,—Many thanks for your kindness in remembering to send me your Charge, which I have ventured to read before acknowledging it. It seems to me an admirable union of “suaviter in modo, fortiter in re.”

‘The remark on the divisions within the Church, as a cogent reason for not being bitter against Dissenters, struck me as peculiarly happy. But though I do not wish the terms of communion to be made narrow, I never miss an opportunity of protesting against that most emphatically schismatical conduct—the denouncing as heterodox of one clergyman by another of the same Church, which is precisely that which regularly-constituted authorities alone have a right to do; and which, therefore, when done by self-constituted judges, goes to subvert the whole structure of an ecclesiastical community, in the same manner as Luddites, White-feet, Rockites, and other

self-constituted judges and rulers in civil matters, go to subvert the foundations of civil society. I said this in a letter, of which a copy found its way among some of the Hampden persecutors of Oxford, and they seemed to feel very sorely on the subject. No wonder, for they are so vehement in their declamations against schism, and so occupied in censuring Dissenters, that it never occurred to them that they were guilty of the greatest possible act of schism themselves. Something of the same kind is going on in the Christian Knowledge Society. A minority, though a large one, have printed a remonstrance, which they have sent to me, and which I presume you have also seen, which I have answered (through Dr. Dickinson)—not touching on the particular points in question, but only on the schismatical character of the proceeding, if they do not apply to, or for the appointment of, some regular tribunal, duly authorised, to decide whether the charge of heterodoxy is established. I have a copy of the correspondence, should you have a curiosity to see it.

‘What you say of anonymous letters reminds me to mention my own practice, and its success. It has long been my rule to look first for the signature, and immediately to burn, unread, every anonymous letter.

‘The first half-year I was here, I dare say I received above 100 ; but as it became generally known that I never read them, the number rapidly diminished, and still continues to diminish ; and now I hardly receive a dozen in a year. I may have lost some valuable information, but I suspect not much, as people always find some other avenue when they find that one closed ; and it is a great evil to encourage the practice by being known to read all, which you must do if you read any.’

Part of the autumn of this year (1838) was spent by the family at Oxford. It was the last time that Dr. Whately made any considerable stay in this the scene of his earliest labours and happiest years. A change had come over the old city, which made it, for him, very different from the 'Alma Mater' of his early days. The band of old friends were scattered, and among those who remained, controversy had brought painful disunion. A blight seemed even to have fallen on the brilliant literary reputation of Oriel; and to him, regarding the whole subject as he did, Oxford was now a place full of very painful associations. When approaching it he has often said, 'I feel as if I were beholding not only the dead face of a dear friend, but his mouldering and decaying corpse.'

At this time, however, it was 'long vacation,' and the renewed recollections of the past were less vivid. And a sister-in-law, much beloved by him, having now, by her marriage with his old friend Professor Pöwell, become fixed at Oxford, gave the place a more cheering aspect in his eyes. His stay in Oxford this year naturally drew his attention much to the controversy still raging, on the subject of Dr. Hampden's lectures. The following letter was written to Mr. Senior on his way home:—

'Rugby: October 10, 1838.

'My dear Senior,—Here we are on our return home. We have been two months in England, for J.'s health, who is better, though far from stout. We were most of the time at Oxford. Not many there, of course, in September, but the Powells were the chief attraction.

'I very much doubt between Oxford and Cambridge for my boy. Oxford, which I should otherwise prefer,

on many accounts, has, at present, two-thirds of the steady reading men Rabbinists, *i.e.* Puseyites.

‘I am led to expect to find, on my return, the Education Board all at sixes and sevens, and shall probably have to resign. I know no particulars, but I hear that —— was there in his late visit to Ireland, and if he did not meddle, I can only say it will have been the only matter I know of in which he has not meddled. “Oh, let me play the lion!”

‘O’Connell, you may have heard, has recommenced agitation, having got up an association of “Precursors,” commonly called, for shortness, *cursters*.

‘I think the town of Oxford seems improved in some respects. The defeat of ——’s attempt to keep his men from Hampden’s lectures is felt as a sore defeat, and there is a talk about repealing the persecuting statute; and the heads who last year appointed ——, apparently for the express purpose of crying up tradition (which he did so extravagantly that he does not venture to publish his Bampton lectures), have elected for next year Congreve, expressly to preach on the other side.

‘I may bring home any memoranda of what you learn respecting education and educational books. I do not mean to leave the Board (if I leave it I must) in hostility, but to continue avowed advocate of the system. See also what you can about prisons and secondary punishments. Sir William Molesworth is still labouring in the cause, and public attention is so far beginning to be roused that a provincial paper lately published the whole of my written evidence, sent in the form of a letter, last session.’

*To the Bishop of Norwich.*

‘Castle: December 22, 1838.

‘My dear Lord,—I snatch a few minutes before the meeting of a Privy Council.

‘You may guess how pressed I have been with business when I tell you that I have had a sermon in hand six weeks, and have but just finished it!

‘Part of my labours are what may seem very strange to some of my brethren—viz., examining candidates for an ordination (to-morrow), and writing a sermon for that occasion. The latter is what I almost always do—the former I never omit, nor ever will; even when I shall be too infirm to take part myself in examining, still, I will have it in my presence. I am convinced it makes a vast difference.

‘Were I inclined to be spiteful, I should feel a malicious satisfaction in your coming in for a share of the obloquy, of which I have had to stem such a tide for so many years. But I grieve that the Church in England should be doing so much to involve itself in the dangers to which that in Ireland is exposed.

‘All things considered, I am disposed to wonder and be grateful at having so far improved, as I have, the tone of the clergy here; a great proportion of whom—though I have been here but seven years—were ordained by myself, or appointed in my time. Any particulars of the modes I have adopted and am labouring to introduce, for effecting such improvements, I shall be happy to communicate.

‘Mr. Parker, I understand, is resolved on bringing ‘London tracts’ in penny numbers. I cannot learn who is to be the prime mover. Powell does not like it; Dr. Hinds does.—In great haste (and in the dusk),

‘Yours very truly,

EE 2

‘R. DUBLIN.’

‘ December 1838.

‘ My dear Senior,—You may now send me, or I to you, ever so large or small a letter. When I tell you that I have been above a month at a sermon (for an ordination for to-day fortnight), and have not quite finished it, you may guess what a pressure of business I have had. I will write to you a scrap at a time as I am able. The Education Board is in a doubtful way. Dr. Murray’s letters related to the principle of the system, about which I never had any doubt. The difficulties have been in details. I have written to Spring-Rice very fully on the subject; and I should like you to put yourself in the way of seeing and hearing what he may have to show or say, if he is so disposed; and if not, I shall be glad to know how he receives your allusions to the subject, and I am ready to give you my account of it.

To speak generally, the difficulty is that Parliament, including the supporters of the present Administration, seem to have a great distrust of the capacity of the Commissioners for conducting national education; and we in Ireland have the most utter distrust of theirs. They expect us, by a skilful system of inspection, to keep up a supply of excellent schoolmasters all over Ireland, at a cost of from 10*l.* to 15*l.* per annum apiece; and they grudge to afford even the necessary cost of that. They are quite ready to lay on us all the blame of every deficiency or abuse that does or that does not (for they believe without inquiring anything that is said of the kind) exist, and to our representations and proposals they turn a deaf ear; in short they “strike, but do not hear.” And Government seem to want either the power or the will, or both, to support us.

‘To take one example out of many; a Mr. —, of the Stationery Office, sent in a representation to the

Treasury of our having disbursed in a certain item ten pounds or so beyond what was necessary ; I forget the exact sum, but I know that the alleged excess of expenditure was beyond the TOTAL of real expenditure—the whole statement being a series of gross blunders. This statement (from a palpably interested quarter) was credited by Government, instantly and certainly, without the least inquiry. And this and similar falsehoods are circulated on both sides the Channel, among those who never dream they can be contradicted.

‘ This may give you a slight notion of the state of things, under which I cannot of course continue to act. I could do no good by attempting it. If Government would take up the matter in earnest, I think they may yet save the system, which is in a precarious state, and must be renovated in some way, soon, or never. The Commissioners are about to propose some measures, one of which, and I should think an essential one, will be the adding of the Irish Secretary and Chancellor as ex-officio members to the Board, so as to bind up the system firmly with Government.’

## CHAPTER XIII.

1839.

Letters to Rev. Baden Powell on his work 'Tradition Unveiled'—Letters to Mr. Senior on Irish Education, Relief, &c.—Letter to Rev. Dr. Dickinson—Starts on a Continental tour—Visits the field of Waterloo—Conversation with the King of the Belgians—Letter to Dr. Dickinson on Switzerland and Italy—Makes the acquaintance of M. Sismondi—Letter to Mr. Senior on 'Travelling'—Disappointed at the failure of his scheme for a new Divinity College—Misrepresentations of the scheme—Returns to Dublin—Letters to Mr. Senior on various subjects—Urged by his friends to attend Parliament—Letter on the subject—Letter to Miss Crabtree—Madame Fabre translates the 'Lessons on the Evidences of Christianity'—Letter to M. Fabre on the translation.

THE first letter in 1839 we shall give, is to the Rev. Baden Powell, then engaged on his work, 'Tradition Unveiled':—

'March 1839.

'My dear Powell,—Provost S., a man of great acuteness, remarked that you seemed to place tradition too low. Have we not, he said, 1st, the Sacred Scriptures by tradition; 2ndly, the inspiration of them by tradition; 3rdly, many practices and many interpretations from tradition?

'The first I admitted, remarking, however, that if a letter from a friend was brought me by a messenger of a tolerably fair character, intellectual and moral, who also *reported* to me (at first, second, or third hand) my friend's oral remarks on the same subject, I should attach

very different degrees of weight to the letter and to the report. I might think the man incapable of forging the letter, and yet might suspect, either that he had partially misunderstood the conversation, or that the intermediate reporters had, or that it was coloured by their prepossessions; or, lastly, that my friend, by not inserting so-and-so in his letter, had designed it only for those he was speaking to, or had meant it to be left at my discretion, not as a direction to be insisted on, like his written directions. Hereupon it was remarked that the traditionists (including the Romanists) may urge that it is a mockery to talk of the infallible certainty of the inspired Sacred Scriptures, if we are to exercise our own confessedly fallible judgment in deciding the question as to their authenticity; for since no chain can be stronger than its weakest link, if we rest our religious belief on the Sacred Scriptures, and refer to tradition for the assumption that they are the Sacred Scriptures, our belief must rest, ultimately, on tradition—a tradition, indeed, which we think more worthy of credit than some which the Romanists hold, but which still we admit only on the decision of our own fallible judgment as to the evidence by which it is supported.

‘All this I admit, and more. Our belief in any point for which we refer to Scripture, must rest on the conviction of our own judgment, not only, 1st, as to the evidence for the safe and unaltered transmission (tradition, if any one chooses to call it so) of the books; but also, 2ndly, as to the evidence for the authors of these books having been really divinely commissioned; and again, 3rdly, as to the evidence for the sense of the passage referred to being such as we understand it in. Hence, I observed, our certainty is only a hypothetical certainty, dependent on the correctness of our judgment on every one of these three points. The weakness of the chain, as far as

fallibility is to be called weakness, is in three of the links, and not merely in one. And the result also I fully admit—viz., that I am fallible, which I should not be if I were infallibly certain of infallibly following an infallible guide.

‘But if another person were to take my word implicitly (or that of Irenæus or Jerome, or any other bishop, ancient or modern) for the conclusion I had thus drawn, taking the word of somebody else for its being my conclusion, this would evidently be only adding a fourth doubtful link to the chain. His choosing to entertain no doubt as to this being my opinion, and as to the correctness of my opinion, would leave him indeed in a state of very comfortable certainty, but would not afford any additional ground for certainty.

‘But the vulgar are deceived sometimes into rejecting at once all religion, on the ground that infallible certainty cannot be obtained (forgetting that, by their own rule, they ought to make out an infallible certainty of its being false); sometimes into resolving that they will reject all doubt; sometimes into preferring some system which has only one weak link in the chain, to that which has several—leaving out of the account the degree of weakness.

‘Once grant that Swedenborg, or Southcote, or the Pope, is God’s vicegerent or ambassador, and there need not be a shadow of doubt as to anything else.

‘Secondly, the tradition of the inspiration of the Sacred Scriptures I admitted to exist, but denied it to be decisive, though it may be confirmatory. But if you admit, *e.g.*, Paul’s epistles to be genuine and not the work of a fool, a madman, or an impostor, he must have been inspired, because he says so.

‘As for the third point, I admit—and so, I said, I conceived you to do—the tradition of various ordinances, &c., which are therefore to be considered with respect, and not

lightly rejected, but yet not put on a par with revelation. The proof is less strong of their being, 1st, really apostolical ; and 2ndly, supposing they were, of their being meant by the Apostles to be of universal obligation.

‘The Provost seemed to acquiesce in what I said. I do not find that others were struck with the objections he made, but it may be worth your while to turn it in your mind.

‘Dr. Wilson was mightily pleased with my calling the traditionals the “Children of the Mist.” The title of “Veiled Prophets” he thought a little too severe.’

*To the same.*

‘I should like you to explain and modify some of your positions in that volume. I agree with you, that to assume the truth of the Bible as a basis for natural theology is to argue in a circle ; but I cannot admit that we either require or can establish a complete demonstration of the being and attributes of a Deity, before we can proceed to inquire whether there be a revelation. (I allude especially to a note in which you, justly, censure those who are for entering on the study of Natural Theology with the Bible in their hand—like beginning Euclid with Newton’s Principia for a guide.) It is enough if you can establish it as a strong probability that there may be a God, and that not necessarily such as we call God—the sole Author of all things ; but simply an unseen intelligent Being, exercising power over this world. And when it is but admitted that there may be such a Being, there is no absurdity in proceeding to inquire what proofs there are of His having directly communicated with man. When this is established, we may justly infer, from such His revelations, His having probably done so-and-so, and

being so-and-so ; of which again we may find confirmation by inspecting more closely the other volume—the created universe. Is not such the historical state of the case? The first Christian preachers went about among the heathen, who were all, in a certain sense, atheists, *i.e.* not believers in an Eternal Creator, but worshippers of certain θεοί who were superhuman, immortal (though not eternal), intelligent, and powerful beings. But the Apostles taught them, you will say, that we are all the creatures of the one God. True ; but how did they prove this? By reference to the miracles which Christ wrought and enabled His followers to work, which proved that He was a messenger from the One who had control over Nature, and who was therefore to be believed when He called Himself the Author and Governor of Nature.

‘ And even now, when we teach children and clowns that God is their Maker, they are usually led on to the study of sacred Scripture before they are even mentally capable of taking in natural theology as an independently-proved basis for ulterior reasonings. True, you will perhaps reply, they take our word in the first instance, both for natural and for revealed religion ; and afterwards, if properly trained, they go over the same ground again, and verify the course of argument. They do ; but in this process of verification it is not necessary that they should have completed the proof of the being and attributes of God from the contemplation of nature, before they begin upon the evidences of revelation. Having fairly satisfied themselves that there is no contradiction or impossibility in conceiving a great Spirit to exist, and to reveal Himself to man, they may fairly proceed to examine the evidences of some such Being having done so ; and when satisfied that He had, they may next inquire what He has taught us respecting Himself.

‘It was, perhaps, some vague and confused idea of this procedure (a procedure which does not appear to me at all illogical) that was in the mind of those who speak of studying Nature with the aid of the Bible.’

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

. . . . . ‘You must endeavour to meet rather more at large the conscientious scruples which many will feel, and many others profess, at giving support to a religion we regard as corrupt. There are several different cases (which it is important not to confound) of allotting money to such a religion :—

‘1. To send out a Roman Catholic mission, or establish priests, chapels, &c., where there would otherwise have been none.

‘2. To furnish the means of education in the Roman Catholic ministry, for a supply of priests to parishes which would otherwise have priests educated elsewhere.

‘3. To transfer to ourselves from the congregation the maintenance of the priests actually officiating.

‘4. To furnish to Roman Catholic children a neutral education, teaching them neither any part of their peculiar system, nor again anything at variance with it; but supplying common instructions, and leaving them to the priests for particulars.

‘5. To give relief of any kind to a poor Roman Catholic, for a share of all his expenditure finds its way to the priest; and if you ever give him an old coat, the next money he gets will pay for a mass instead of a coat. Of all these it may be said, in a certain sense, that they are encouraging the Roman Catholic religion; but the cases are of very different complexions, and a man might consistently scruple at one and not at another.

‘No. 1 is not thought of; 2 is Maynooth; 3 is what you propose; 5 is very like it, and is what no one has any scruple about; 4 is the system of National Education, and also (according to their distinctly professed design) of the Kildare Place Schools.’

‘Redesdale: March 21, 1839.

‘My dear Senior,—I quite agree with you that there ought always to have been an interchange of Irish and English bishops and clergy; nor do I think it at all too late now. I should like to see some Dublin curate preferred to a Government living. Nor would there be, I think, any objection to removing an Irish bishop, supposing him fit, to an English see. The reason, I believe, it has not been done is, not that it would have seemed to take a man from an arduous to an easy station (quite the contrary), but because it was thought anything was good enough for an Irish bishopric. But if it had always been the practice, this would not, I think, make any difference at all in my case at present, because a removal from a higher dignity to a lower (a thing which in my view is nothing, but which is much thought of)—and that, too, at such a crisis for the Irish branch of the Church as, perhaps, never occurred before—would not have failed to be interpreted as a desertion, just as much as it would now.

‘This is all I wish to add to what I wrote last. In all the rest I agree with you, and you may use your discretion.

‘You must not judge too hardly of me in respect of any defects in the report, for if I could have had but one month uninterrupted, I should have had more chance of doing at least my best than I have had in two years and a half, without even any one day unbroken by other pressing and distracting business.

‘When Cæsar wrote, read, listened all at once, he did all three, no doubt, as ill as any dunce. Pray let me hear more about Hampden after your return from Oxford.

‘Ever yours,

‘R. W.

‘P.S.—Some reasons for not recommending compulsory relief for all who are in distress are just drawn up, and will be forwarded to Mr. Blake.’

The following letter to Dr. Dickinson, written when he was starting for the Continent with his family, is characteristic in reference to his favourite old pursuits in Natural History :—

*To Dr. Dickinson.*

‘Bangor: May 1839.

‘My dear D.,—Passage rather rough, though not tedious. All very sick, including myself. Starting at that time in the morning suits me ill. The “Sun,” which we have seen, states positively that Peel has been looked at and sent back, and Lord Melbourne summoned again. Is Peel manœuvring to keep among the bowlers? which he plainly likes better than batting. — is mentioned as among the party at Peel’s; and like a rat without a tail, I’ll do, I’ll do. . . .

‘Pray leave word at the Palace of our safety. When you are fixed at Killiney, remember to ask Mrs. Coleman for your ducklings, that is, if your bairns like them. When I was of their age I had two, which I used to carry about the garden on the palm of my hand, and hold them to any bough that had caterpillars on it. They travelled as quietly as passengers on the top of a coach.’

The continental journey, alluded to in some of these

letters, took place in May of this year, on account of the health of one of his family. Where the welfare of others, and especially his children, was concerned, he spared no effort ; but, as has been observed, travelling afforded him in general but little pleasure. The ordinary objects of sightseers in continental towns had little or no charm for him. He visited the field of Waterloo, and during a stay of some days at Brussels became acquainted with several distinguished literary and political characters, both among Belgians, and in the circle of eminent Italian exiles who were then residing in that city. He dined with the King of the Belgians on this occasion, at his palace at Lacken. Walking next morning in the park with his brother-in-law, he observed, ‘I rather startled his Majesty by an observation I made to him—viz., that he set a bad example to the States of Europe.’

‘No wonder,’ replied his companion ; ‘but how did you justify the remark ?’

‘I added,’ he resumed, ‘that his Majesty afforded the best specimen possible of the value of an elective monarchy.’

From Brussels the party proceeded, by the Rhine, Frankfort, Heidelberg, and Baden, to Switzerland. At Frankfort, where a few days were spent, Dr. Whately formed an acquaintance—it might almost be called a friendship, brief as their intercourse was—with the Syndic Sieveking of Hamburg, in whom he found one whose powers of mind, high cultivation, and enlarged views, were peculiarly fitted to appreciate his own, and in whose society he enjoyed an intercourse most congenial to him. The correspondence to which this meeting led was continued at intervals as long as the Syndic lived.

The two letters which follow give, the one, his general

impressions of what he saw of Switzerland and Italy ; the other, of travelling in general :—

*To Dr. Dickinson.*

‘Varenna, on Lake Como : June 24, 1839.

‘My dear D.,— ——’s attack at Zurich kept us there but a few days. Fortunately, we found there a physician whom we both thought very well of. We had a severe day’s journey on Friday, crossing the Splügen pass, which was rather too much for her, but she is now recovering from it. Think of the amusement of pelting each other with snowballs on the 21st June, at 6,500 feet elevation. Rhododendrons in great beauty at the edge of the snow—no heath in the high parts, and hardly a bird to be seen.

‘Here the weather is very hot ; several nightingales in full song, which is very late for them ; a garden full of orange-trees ; but there is no other place to stir out except the dusty road skirting the lake. Mountains come down close to the water on all sides, which I don’t like so well as a mixture of mountain and plain. The Alps, of course, beat everything in the British Isles, but the lake itself, though very beautiful, does not, in my mind, near equal Killarney : it wants the islands. The country is enclosed, beyond the neighbourhood of Dublin. Nothing but narrow paths between vineyards and olive-yards. To-morrow we propose starting for Como, and—

‘[26 June, Milan.] staying a few days, I was going to say, if found equal to descriptions ; but on arriving last night (by steamer) we found it so dull and close that we started this morning at eight for Milan, where we stay a day or two to get clothes washed, &c., &c., and because the children would not like to be so near a celebrated city without seeing it. I have ordered any letters that may

arrive (I have had none) to be forwarded to the places on our route, which will be by Lago Maggiore to the Simplon and Geneva.

‘—— is decidedly better. The passage by steamer on the lake is just the thing for her. I am glad to be relieved from the everlasting valleys, Swiss and Italian, though this is a dead flat, and has no beauty but that of full cultivation.

‘I had no idea the ancient sculptors were so correct in their oxen. You recognise in the ox of this country exactly the peculiar face of their sculpture.

‘We propose to start to-morrow for Baveno on Lago Maggiore. The cathedral is the most gigantic idolatrous temple I ever saw. I need not describe it, as books do that so much better. It is a pain to me to visit such places. The chief idol is the Virgin and Babe. I marvel at those Protestants who admire the devotion of Roman Catholics, and their stepping in at any hour of any day to say their private prayers in the churches, which are always open. It is the very essence of their error, in making a temple of a Christian synagogue. I hope your book is going on well. If you do not repeat again and again that the main point is the double doctrine, and yet from the nature of the case the least prominent characteristic of the party, you will have said too little. I should almost be inclined to use as a motto (at any rate introduce it somewhere), “portaque emittit eburna.”’

After a few days in Northern Italy, the party crossed the Simplon, and made a short stay at Geneva, where they made an acquaintance, not less interesting than their former ones, with the celebrated historian Sismondi and his accomplished wife, and at his house were introduced to several literary characters of note.

The following extract from a letter to Mr. Senior shows his feelings with respect to travelling in general :—

‘Geneva: July 1839.

‘Travelling itself, or rather being from home, is to me very dull, for want of something to do. I have been too long an actor, in very stirring parts, to be interested as a spectator. I have outlived the power of being amused, for above a day or two at a time, with the mere passive process of seeing sights. The thing is, I have been so long habituated to be among persons and institutions dependent on me for many important benefits, and with a view to whom I am daily taking measures, that I find it flat to be surrounded by mere objects which are nothing to me, nor I to them, and without any object to accomplish. Considering how much I am usually overlooked and too painfully interested, it might be expected that the most complete contrast would be the most refreshing; and so it would be but for two circumstances,—1st, that the absence of employment is concentrated instead of being distributed through the year: to consume my year’s allowance of salt or of wine in a month, would not only be no compensation for going without for the rest of the year, but would be far from refreshing; 2ndly, I have not a long vacation, as at Oxford, in which everything stands still till my return; my vessel is not laid up in port, but is not only still at sea, while I have the rudder, but is assailed by fresh storms from that very cause; for all my opponents (*i.e.* all violent partisans of all sides) watch their opportunity to plot as soon as my back is turned; and though they never find D—— asleep on his post, they always try what they can do.

‘We hope to be in London the 27th instant. The prophecy of 31st May is not literally fulfilled, but I still

think it likely it will be in substance. For Ireland, the Whigs make a bad Government, and the Tories, I fear, a worse (from the want of confidence in their good intentions, and the experience of their yielding to threats); in England, probably, *vice versâ*. I wish, but hardly dare hope, for a Government which should employ, without feelings of jealousy, men of superior talents as well as integrity, instead of trusting exclusively to "iron-witted fools and unrespective boys," and making unscrupulousness a primary recommendation.'

While this letter was being written, a piece of intelligence was on its way to the Archbishop, which could not fail to bring him deep disappointment and mortification.

As has been observed, he had long been desirous of establishing a separate college for Divinity students, not in opposition in any way to Trinity College, but to supply the need—acknowledged at that time by leading persons in the Irish Church—of a more systematic and distinctive course of theological training than was practicable in a college in which this was not the sole object.

That many leading members of Trinity College misapprehended the plan, and imagined that it would interfere with the working of the older institution, was, perhaps, not to be wondered at, though to be regretted.

As they were unwilling to have it in connection with Trinity College, the Archbishop took steps to procure a charter independently of it. The funds were to be supplied from a portion of the see property, and the old palace at Tallagh was fixed on as the site. The Queen's letter was signed, commanding the charter to be drawn up and the Great Seal affixed (the Archbishop saw it afterwards at the Castle); and he went abroad with the most distinct assurance that all was done, and nothing remained

to complete the work but the mere forms of engrossing and affixing the seal to the charter. As soon as he was on the Continent and out of reach—for in those days railroads and electric telegraphs had not become sufficiently general to admit of that rapid communication which is now practicable even with far more distant localities—the persons opposed to the scheme, and even some who had appeared its friends, immediately availed themselves of the opportunity to set on foot an opposition, which proved a successful one, to this plan for the improved education of the clergy. Remonstrances were poured in to the new Lord-Lieutenant,<sup>1</sup> full of misrepresentations of the whole scheme; and he, not understanding probably the true state of the case, promised at once to stop the measure.

It was while at Geneva that the Archbishop received the painful and mortifying tidings that the plan he had laboured, at the expense of personal sacrifices, to promote, was dashed to the ground; and this in a way which could not but awaken feelings of disgust as well as mortification at the manner in which the opposition had been conducted, and the want of straightforwardness and manly uprightness shown by those who, if conscientiously opposed to the plan, might at least have remonstrated while its promoter was still on the spot, instead of waiting till his absence left them the power of working without his knowledge.

The plan was never revived, but some good arose even after its ultimate defeat. Those who had been most strongly opposed to it, still felt that some efforts must be made to improve the education of the clergy. The tutors turned their attention to giving lectures on the Greek

<sup>1</sup> Lord Ebrington (afterwards Lord Fortescue) succeeded Lord Mulgrave in April 1839.

Testament; and from this time a decided improvement was to be observed in the candidates who presented themselves for examination. Thus the Archbishop's efforts, though in part failing, were not altogether fruitless as regarded the object he had in view.

Early in September the Archbishop was again at his post; and the first letter after his return shows the peculiar difficulties with which he had to contend:—

‘Redesdale: September 11, 1839.

‘My dear Senior,—Yours only reached me yesterday. We came by Liverpool,—a very smooth passage; and having breakfasted on Monday morning at your house, we had rather an early breakfast here on the Tuesday.

‘I am going to reprint “Whately on Shakspeare,” and have cribbed some extracts from your review for an appendix. Dreadfully wet and sometimes stormy weather, but it is said not to have been quite so bad in England. The harvest, however, must have suffered much. Potatoes a large crop, though not of good quality. Lord Lansdowne is said by the papers to have reached Frankfort, and I suppose has delivered my introduction to Sieveking. What think you of the changes in the Cabinet? O’Connell has addressed a letter to the English people (clever), to exhort them to turn Roman Catholics. I don’t feel certain of his motives. Is it to gain the credit of religious zeal? or does he hope to strengthen his party by actual converts?—Burke on the sublime has some very just observations on Tragedy. A well-written article in the “Edinburgh,” I should think in the year ’12 or ’13, has still better, mostly borrowed (though without acknowledgment) from Burke, but improved, and admirably expressed. I forget whether it was in an article on Crabbe, or on

what.<sup>1</sup> Beattie, in his essay on composition, though far from satisfactory, has on the whole the best remarks in Comedy. In pointing out for Nassau<sup>2</sup> these books, which are open to every candidate to consult, I am doing nothing unfair. It would be otherwise if I gave him privately (supposing I were able) some valuable thoughts not accessible to others. But in truth the subject (or rather subjects) is very difficult, and therefore ill-chosen.'

*Extract from a Letter to the same—probably about the same time—on attendance in Parliament.*

'If any regular attack is made in the House, it must be, I suppose, with sufficient notice to enable me to come over on purpose; but as to continual presence on the spot, here or in England, I have found by experience that (in respect of the Board) I am much more wanted here. It has hardly ever happened but that something has gone wrong when I was away. And I say this not as any boast; for it would be much more to my credit if I could, both in that and in other departments, put things on such a footing as to go well without me. But though Dickinson is all I could wish, and has actually prevented many evils which no other man that I know of could have prevented, there are many who will listen to no one but the Archbishop himself; so that I am forced to do a great deal by letters, and that very imperfectly, which he could do quite as well, if he could but personate me. As for the *English* education question, if ministers were to ask

<sup>1</sup> The review alluded to was one of Crabbe, by Lord Jeffrey, and will be found in his collected works.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. N. Senior, his friend's son, who was then writing for a prize at King's College.

my advice on it, it would be, to beg all their friends who were connected with the *Irish* Board to keep *out of the way*. I cannot think it possible but that they would excite or keep up the jealousy, already felt by so many, of a design to transfer, by degrees, the principles of the Irish system to England; a suspicion of which, whether well or ill-founded, would be fatal to both. It is as much as Ministers themselves will be able to do to get people to attend to explanations of nice distinctions between the circumstances of the two countries, such as make that which is suited to one unsuited to the other.

‘Whether Government does or does not design ultimately to identify the two systems, it is essential that all idea of such design should be kept out of men’s minds. If it shall appear that much business in which I can profitably take a part is coming on nearly at the same time, I must submit to bring over my family; but in the two sessions in which I did sit, I am inclined to think I could have done all the good I did (and avoided the evil)—I mean, sitting on that committee—in a fortnight. I trust I do not feel more than I ought the personal sacrifice; though it is something considerable, in addition to the increased labour to myself, that each time I could only get a house which greatly injured the health of my family; but in respect of the diocese the sacrifice is great, as I have always found something wrong as sure as I am away, though not always to so great a degree as on the occasion of my two last absences; and, after all, it seems to be for no object, or next to none. I always either come in or go out in the middle of any important matter in which it is conceivable I might effect something. One who is in Parliament every session may indeed do nothing, or nothing good; but he has his chance of a trial. The plant that is constantly mown

down in flower can never bear seed. Had I ten times the talent for business, and the eloquence, and the influence that I have, the utmost I could expect would be that either I should be obliged to draw off my forces just as they were following up a successful charge, and see everything retaken, or else bring them up just when every part had been carried that I could have defended, and when the battle was irretrievably lost. By a party-man, or one whose successors would follow up his views, something might be effected alternate sessions, but with me the reverse is the case.

‘ You do not say who is to be the new bishop. I wish you could call the attention of Government to the Penitentiary under Mr. Brabner at Glasgow, which by all I could learn would be a model for such as might be established generally, so as to supersede all other secondary punishments. His prisoners, even for the longest term, are kept the whole time for a less expense than the mere transports to New South Wales cost, without reckoning the expenses *there*. They reformed, it seems, more or less in every case that affords any reasonable hope of it; and, in one word, the effects seem to be all one could reasonably wish. He came over here inspecting our gaols, and has written a report on them, which is printed (a very unfavourable one), and I also had much conversation with him.

‘ Ever yours,

‘ R. W.’

Of the following letters to Miss Crabtree, one is an answer to a question of hers, on a report spread that Dr. Arnold had become ‘ Puseyite ’ or Tractarian; the other concerns a translation made by Madame Fabre, wife of one of the principal pastors of Lausanne, of the ‘ Lessons on the Evidences of Christianity.’ The Archbishop took

a lively interest in the foreign translations of his works, and in many instances contributed a part or a whole of the expense of the printing:—

‘November 9, 1839.

‘My dear Miss Crabtree,—I had thought there was no fabrication about Dr. Arnold (or indeed myself) so monstrous as to raise any surprise. If they were to say he had turned Swedenborgian, or Mussulman, or (as one man said of me) an Antinomian-Armenian, I should not have wondered. But a Puseyite! it is “beyond all shouting.” Read the article in the “Edinburgh Review,” on Dr. Hampden and the Oxford malignants, which came out soon after the beginning of the Hampden persecution, and you will see pretty much what his views are of the Puseyites. He hardly dares to think (as in my case also) of sending a son to Oxford, for fear of being infected with this Protestant Popery.

‘In great haste, yours very truly,

‘RICHARD WHATELY.

‘Kindest regards to your whole party.’

On the same subject he writes thus to M. Fabre, the husband of his accomplished translator:—

*To Monsr. Fabre, Pasteur at Lausanne.*

‘Dublin: December 12, 1839.

‘Reverend Sir,—I address you in the only language I am master of, being certain that you, or at least your lady, will prefer good English to bad French.

‘It was with heartfelt gratitude to the Giver of all good that I heard of the projected translation of the tract on Evidences. I am most anxious, not only to diffuse as widely as possible religious knowledge and faith, but also to draw more closely the ties which ought to bind together Christians of all nations and languages, “as fellow-

subjects of that eternal kingdom in which there is neither Jew nor Greek, barbarian, Scythian, bond or free." With this view, a daughter of mine had begun a translation of the tract into French and also into Italian, and has completed nearly a third, with the assistance and correction of two (native) French teachers. But you will have much superior facilities in diffusing the work, at least through Switzerland.

'I will transmit to you the sum of 21*l*. (as soon as I can learn through Miss Crabtree in what way I can do so), to cover the expenses beforehand; and when the work is published, you may send me fifty copies for the present, that I may try how far they will be acceptable in France, Belgium, and Canada. The rest of the 700 I will send for hereafter, if I find them wanted; and if not, I will let you know, that you may dispose of them yourself. From the specimen you have sent, it has been pronounced by better judges than myself, that Madame Fabre's translation is likely to prove an important benefit to the French public. One or two small corrections have been suggested, which I really did not think worth notice. Perhaps she may, in some places, a little improve the connection of the sentences, so as to avoid what is expressed by the French word "*decousu*." I take for granted that Madame Fabre is open to the most rigorous criticism, anxious only for the public good of the Christian world, and ready to take pains in making what is good still better. I judge by myself, having been rather a voluminous author, and having laboured more at the style of that little tract than that of any volume I ever published. The whole was subjected to the most careful revision of friends, and written over three or four times.

'If you think it worth while to send over a copy of the whole manuscript, I will revise it, with the assistance of

my daughter and her masters, and point out any corrections that may appear needful; but the translation (judging from the specimen) is so good as it is, that I do not suppose this would make any important difference.

‘ I have sent to Miss Crabtree some books for you (by different authors), such as I thought likely to be new to you and interesting; and some of which, or portions of them, might succeed in a French translation. I have already appeared twice in French: at Liege was published, “Notions Élémentaires sur l’Économie Politique,” which is a most excellent version from my original, by M. Vischer. It is sold for 25 centimes, and is widely circulated, I understand, in France as well as Belgium. At Paris you can procure also “Doutes Historiques sur Napoléon,” a translation of a little work which has also, I hear, appeared in German, having of late attracted much attention from its serving as an answer (though written long before) to Professor Strauss’s theories. I wish I had heard of you from Miss Crabtree before I passed through Lausanne last summer. Her recommendation would have induced me to seek the pleasure of your acquaintance. If there are many of your countrywomen equal to her in worth and intelligence, you are much to be congratulated.

‘ Believe me to be, with much respect,

‘ Your sincere well-wisher and fellow-servant,

‘ R. WHATELY,

‘ Archbishop of Dublin.’

*Extract from a Letter.*

‘ December 1839.

‘ The “twaddlers” to whom it seems I have introduced you, however intrinsically despicable, derive great importance from circumstances. Theirs is the last new fashion.

As the fine gentlemen of Queen Elizabeth's times delighted to exhibit themselves in masks as "salvage men," with wreathed boughs round their loins, so it is in vogue among a certain set of educated men to declaim against evidence, reason, science, argument, learning, and all, in short, that they denote by the title of "pride of intellect," and to cry up the purity and the pious faith of our worthy forefathers, and of unsophisticated peasants; and as the costume of the above-mentioned make-believe salvages was admired because it was known that they *had* handsome clothes in their wardrobes, so these irrationalists are listened to with wonderful favour in their "babbling o' green fields," because it is known that many of them do themselves possess the intellectual cultivation which they decry.'

## CHAPTER XIV.

1840.

Letter to Dr. Hinds on 'Tradition,' &c.—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Attends Parliament—Letters to Mr. Senior on his Parliamentary attendance—Letters to Dr. Dickinson—Introduced to M. Guizot—Letter to a clergyman soliciting for a parish—Hints to Transcendentalists—Visits Tenby—Letter to Dr. Hinds on Church History—Renewed intercourse with M. Sismondi—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Lady Osborne on her praying for the Archbishop—Appointment of Dr. Dickinson to the Bishopric of Meath—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Letter on the elevation of Dr. Dickinson—Dissolution of Parliament—Letter to Mr. Senior—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Letter to Dr. Hinds on 'Absolution' and on Fairy Tales—Letter of advice to one troubled with religious difficulties.

IN 1840, we find the Archbishop writing to Dr. Hinds on the then much-vexed questions of tradition, reserve, and the gradual teaching of Gospel truth by Our Lord and His Apostles, on which the Tract party then so strongly insisted :—

'My dear Hinds,—If you were asked to reconcile, "I have called you friends; for the servant knoweth not," &c.,<sup>1</sup> with "Ye cannot bear them now; when He, the Spirit of truth, shall come, He shall *teach* you,"<sup>2</sup> &c., what should you say?

'The Gnostics are apt to say that Jesus did not reveal

<sup>1</sup> John xv. 15.<sup>2</sup> John xvi. 12.

the Gospel, and taught little else than the Jewish Law, leaving the Gospel to His Apostles ; and the Mystics say that the Apostles did not reveal it in their writings, since these contain only what already had been (though obscurely) hinted by Jesus ; and that therefore the main part of the Gospel must have been left to the Church's tradition.

‘ Do you agree, on this point, with Hawkins's tradition ?

‘ I should like you to make the acquaintance of Dr. Taylor (Camden Town), the writer for the “Athenæum,” and for Parker of West Strand. He is engaged now in a work suggested by me, the “Natural History of Man, Savage and Civilised.” He would receive a pupil of mine with open arms. I think you might serve one another.

‘ Ever yours affectionately,

‘ R. WHATELY.

‘ Seventh edition of “Logic” going to press.’

‘ January 28, 1840.

‘ My dear Hinds,—The use made by the Traditionists of those passages is this : they find, they say, a promise of Jesus of a further revelation, and in the writings of the Apostles they find no doctrines but what had been taught or hinted at in His discourses ; hence they infer that the further revelation promised must have been committed to tradition.

‘ Now my (present) idea is, that the admission of the Gentiles, and the final abolition of the Law, was the only new matter of distinct revelation after the departure of Jesus, and that even of that He had given many hints, not indeed meant to be understood at the time, nor even afterwards sufficient for their complete guidance, but only enough to identify His teaching with that of the Holy Spirit, to show that the call of the Gentiles was not, as

infidels suggest, an afterthought introduced by Paul. And as for all other matters, the teaching of the Spirit was only a development and explanation of what Jesus had slightly and obscurely taught.

‘Now for another point : “The scribes, &c., sit in Moses’ seat ; whatsoever therefore they bid you,” &c. Now this cannot extend to precepts which “make the word of God of none effect ;” it must apply to the settling and fixing of things intrinsically indifferent. Does the authority here conceded to those scribes differ at all from what Jesus gave to Peter and the other Apostles in His Church—viz., “Whatsoever ye shall bind,” &c. ? If the authority of the Jewish and of the Christian elders be the very same in kind and in degree, have we not an exact key to the latter ?

‘I see a New Zealand journal advertised, but no editor or conductor’s name. Do you know of it ? It will never take unless supported by some known names.’

*To Bishop Copleston.*

‘Dublin : February 15, 1840.

‘My dear Lord,—I cannot engage myself to any sermon, as my residence in England this spring will be for short intervals, determined by circumstances not under my control, else I should be very happy to lend my aid to a school. For it is only by making the rising generation rational beings, and not mere unfeathered bipeds, that Socialism and all other such poisons can be effectually counteracted. The law—not perhaps in these regions, but in despotic countries—may guard the people against the “arrow that flieth in the noonday,” but not against the greater danger of the “pestilence that walketh in darkness.”

‘I am pressed to come over to take part in storming

the breach that has been effected in the Transportation system, for it seems Ministers will not wholly destroy the abuse without a little external pressure ; but public attention having been a little directed to the subject, all the other parts of the task are comparatively easy. “It is proved already that you are stark knaves, and it will go near to be thought so,” is Shakspeare’s (unconscious, as I believe) description of what takes place in the most important matters every day. When a just and important principle has fought its way through opposition to a general acceptance, it is enrolled on the list of undeniable and admirable truths, and placed, as it were, in the heaven of Epicurean gods. “*Ascribi quietis ordinibus patiar deorum*,” it is assented to by the understanding, but takes no hold of the feelings and habitual course of thought ; it is somewhat in the condition (I dare say you remember the occurrence) of the 47th Euclid in the mind of the pupil, who, after expressing his satisfaction with the demonstration, added, “But it is not really so, is it?” “True in theory but false in practice” is another expression of the same thing. A slight step beyond this is to admit that so-and-so would have been very good if it had been originally established, but that it is too late to introduce it now ; or that it will be very good at the Millennium, but that it is too early now.

‘All this time the truth in question is but an undeveloped bud ; but at length, after it has long been “proved,” it comes to be “thought,” and at length practically applied.

‘How I wish they could bring the tube and wire under the sea, across the Irish Channel ! I do not despair of its being done, though not in my time. I could then make my motion in the House of Lords without quitting my post here, where I am peculiarly wanted just now.’

This year (1840) was that of his session in Parliament, and his English friends, as usual, and especially Mr. Senior, were anxious to press on him the importance of more constant and regular attendance than he had of late given. But he was more and more impressed every session with the belief, that the good he could do in such periodical attendance was small compared with the evils which prolonged absence from his diocese necessarily occasioned; and though he resided in London for a time, on three or four occasions after this, and at other times came up on any special call for a few days, he frequented the House less and less. His views on the subject are given in the accompanying letter:—

‘Dublin : January 28, 1840.

‘My dear Senior,—What you say about attendance in the House of Lords struck me at first as very reasonable, and the more I reflect on the subject, the more inclined I am to think you quite in the right, and to act accordingly.

‘The business of a member of the Legislature is certainly, as you say, a business, but such that a man should have no other business, at least during session. I should only make such modifications in and what you say as are necessary for the application, and of it to my own particular case. *E.g.*, when you speak of the necessary reading in the morning, in order to prepare oneself for the debate, as about an hour and a half’s easy work (*viz.*, for you), I understand by this about three hours’ most harassing and exhausting labour to me, on account of the extreme difficulty I have in turning my course of thoughts from one subject to another. I am (in this respect, though not in others) like a steam-carriage, which you may have observed to take usually as many minutes as an ordinary

cart does seconds in getting into a new line of road. Besides the reading and the attendance in the House, which would not occupy perhaps, on the average, above five or six hours, the whole thoughts of the rest of the day must be as nearly as possible engrossed with the same subjects. I say, as nearly as possible, because even with the most inadequate attention to the diocese, such as would leave the weeds to run to seed most copiously, still I could not quite throw that business overboard, or prevent its being a heavy addition to parliamentary business : 1st, because so much that would be despatched in a few minutes' *conversation* requires the reading and writing of letters ; and 2nd, because the moment I am out of the way, plots are laid, dissensions arise, &c., and, in short, the occasions for my personal interference are multiplied threefold, notwithstanding the utmost discretion and vigilance of those to whom I intrust the care of affairs.

‘Proceeding, then, on such a course, it is not unlikely—supposing I did not completely break down under the excessive fatigue—that in time I might acquire, as you observe, such a familiarity with parliamentary business, and hold on the attention of the House, as would eventually give me some influence. But this “time” would be far longer in my case, as an independent member, judging of each question on its own merits, than for one who joins a party. A stick that would make a very respectable addition to the bundle, must take several years to grow up into a substantive tree. People have to learn all one’s opinions one by one, instead of referring at once to the general creed of a certain school or party. But perhaps, by great exertion and good luck, I might by the end of the session be so far advanced as to have a prospect of exercising some little influence in the next ; but *then* I am *out*, and a year and a half

after I should have to begin nearly from the bottom of the hill again ! The only way I can think of for keeping the stone rolling back, would be to reside constantly in London during the next session ; also to attend constantly in the House as an auditor, and to converse in lobbies with such members as I meet with on all that was going on. In this way I might perhaps in the course of three or four sessions (*i.e.* six or eight years) be somebody in the House. What the state of the diocese would be at the end of that time, you cannot adequately conjecture ; but you know enough of how laborious the metropolitan diocese of Ireland must be, and how beset with difficulties, and how incessantly I have laboured, and how much, and also how little, I have done in eight years. You know enough of this to make it absurd for me to ask seriously whether you would advise me to make a great, a certain, and an immediate sacrifice of a definite duty (to say nothing of risks), for the chance of a remote, contingent, and probably small advantage. You would naturally refer me to the fable of the dog snapping at the shadow.

‘What you say impresses the more strongly on my mind what I have always thought respecting the extreme awkwardness of the mode in which the Church is represented. It is as if the Universities, instead of electing Members of Parliament, were represented by such-and-such a professor or college-tutor, who would of course, generally speaking, be the more inefficient member of Parliament, in proportion as he was the more devoted to his own proper business. This applies even to English bishops, except those few who, besides being blessed with unusual strength, and talents for business, have also their dioceses either in or close to London. But as for Irish bishops, I wish the *mockery* of giving them an apparent place in Parliament, sitting by single ses-

sions, were fairly done away at once. The only influence they can thus have is possessed by those who choose to bind themselves together, and agree that whoever is in Parliament should be the mere spokesman of the body. I should think the present ministry must know so much by this time.

‘If I had been in the House t’other night, I should have said something about the Chartists; and as it would most likely have been unacceptable to more than one party, perhaps it is as well I was not there. I should have adverted to the party who are incessantly railing at all those who wish to make the labouring classes rational, and to found religion on conviction, instead of “faith” (*i.e.* on itself)—a party supported and patronised by prelates, who then wonder to find the people, whom they have left defenceless, overpowered by their assailants. And we come to exercise parental guardianship over these helpless innocents by silencing with secular coercion those who are misleading them. Should we not begin at home—*i.e.*, first silence those who at Protestant meetings revile in gross terms seven millions of their fellow-subjects? If these seven millions are in error (as I think they are) do not the Socialists represent Christians as in error? If the Socialists are to be prohibited from disgusting and irritating the mind of a fellow-subject who is, as they maintain, erroneous in his belief, has he a right to disgust and irritate his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects for being in his judgment erroneous in theirs? I am disposed to think the ultra-extravagance of the Socialists makes them (like an overdose of arsenic) less dangerous than those rather less mild.’

The summons to take his seat in Parliament came at last in the shape of letters from his friends, showing that

an important question was to be brought forward. He answered it thus:—

‘April 6, 1840.

‘My dear Senior,—In true Irish style I send this to say that I shall not, as I had designed, sail to-day, on account of the gale, which is furious. I think, however, of venturing to-morrow, if it is at all better. As it is in my power to take a part, I think it a duty to do so, though a more odious duty can hardly be conceived than that of coming forward (if such should be the result) to defend the State, apparently, at the expense of the Church, and to propose an apparent sacrifice of the revenues of my brethren in Canada, involving no diminution of my own. It will have been, I conceive, the most invidious task (and that is a bold word) ever imposed on me. Miss Fox speaks of the weight of my character, which I believe is as often as not a negative quantity, in which point of view I expect it will be increased.’

The following letters appear to have been written about this time. The terse and pithy setting-forth of the principles in the second of these, on which the Archbishop acted with regard to the disposal of livings, is quite characteristic; and all who knew his mode of action are well aware that he acted strictly up to the principles there laid down:—

*To Rev. Dr. Dickinson.*

‘Thursday, May 16.

‘My dear D.,— . . . Shall I print as an appendix to the essay on Persecution, in the “Romish Errors,” a part (and what part?) of the appendix to the Jew Bill speech? Miss F. told me she heard Sydney Smith exclaiming, “This is unanswerable,” and found, on inquiry,

he was reading that. I told her I might be allowed to say it was at least thus far unanswered.

Mr. Woodward says the schools have all diseases: the Roman Catholic, the plague; the Protestant Church, the lethargy; the Presbyterians, the jaundice; and the Arians, the palsy. There is much truth in this, and the same may be said of all human communities and assemblies. In Parliament, for instance, the Tories have a putrid fever, the Whigs a tertian ague, and the Radicals a brain-fever. But it is providentially ordered that different diseases check one another, and so the world goes on. Our schools are hospitals in which there is an advantage above literal hospitals, that they have a panacea suited to all diseases alike—a knowledge of Gospel history and general mental cultivation. If in proportion as these extend, Romanism gains ground, that I must admit will be a strong presumption that it is true.

*To a Clergyman who wrote to solicit for a parish.*

‘Dear Sir,—There are many points which I wish to impress on the minds of all my clergy: 1st, that none of them is to think, in case of his not obtaining preferment as soon as he may wish, that he is overlooked by me—his character and proceedings unknown—or his deserts, whatever they may be, disregarded; 2ndly, that in the event that any one of them does obtain preferment from me, he is not to suppose that he owes it, in any degree, to any application made by himself; and 3rdly, that in the same event, he is not to attribute my disposal of preferment to any consideration of his pecuniary wants; as the only case in which such a consideration could influence me—that of a perfect equality as to all other points between two individuals—is not likely often to occur. When-

ever there is any difference at all in point of qualifications, I think myself forced to regard the interest of the public as everything, and that of the individual as nothing.'

It was during his short stay in London this year (April—May) that Dr. Whately was introduced to Guizot, then French ambassador. Although these volumes hardly furnish a fitting occasion for the insertion of the opinions of others respecting him, yet the account of the impression made by him on an observer at once so acute, and so far removed from English party or local opinion, may interest:—

‘ Parmi les prélats anglicans avec lesquels je fis connaissance, l’archevêque de Dublin, M. Whately, correspondant de notre institut, m’intéressa et me surprit; esprit originel, fécond, inattendu, instruit et ingénieux plutôt que profond dans les sciences philosophiques et sociales, le meilleur des hommes, parfaitement désintéressé, tolérant, libéral, populaire, et, à travers son infatigable activité et son intarissable conversation, étrangement distrait, familier, ahuri, dégingandé, aimable et attachant, quelque impolitesse qu’il commette et quelque convenance qu’il oublie. Il devait parler le 13 avril, à la Chambre des Lords, contre l’archevêque de Cantorbéry et l’évêque d’Exeter, dans la question des liens à réserver pour le clergé au Canada. “ Je ne suis pas sûr,” me dit Lord Holland, “ que dans son indiscrete sincérité il ne dise pas qu’il ne sait point de bonne raison pour qu’il y ait, à la Chambre des Lords, un banc des évêques.” Il ne parla point, car le débat n’eut pas lieu; mais, dans cette occasion comme dans toute autre, il n’eût certainement pas sacrifié aux intérêts de la corporation la moindre parcelle de ce qu’il eût regardé “ comme la vérité ou le bien public.”’ (*Mémoires*, vol. v. chap. xxx.)

The following *jeu-d'esprit* is probably merely the substance of something which was to have been expanded further—an ironical piece of advice, written as by an infidel of the Transcendental School, suggesting to his friends and colleagues to work through the medium of Tractarianism. The Archbishop often insisted on the resemblance between the two :—

*Hints to Transcendentalists for working infidel designs  
through Tractarianism.*

‘Experience has shown that an attempt to drive out superstition (except by substituting another) produces a reaction; for one convert to genuine philosophy, fifty zealots. The only way is, instead of cutting down the weeds, which makes them grow the faster, to apply some dressing to their roots which shall make them wither gradually. Why not leave the unenlightened vulgar in the arms of Christianity, taking care only that in proportion as they become enlightened they shall throw it off? For till they become so they will only fly from one form of superstition to another. But why (it may be said) not leave philosophy to do its own work? Answer: Experience shows that men considerably above the vulgar in many respects, are yet overcome by their religious weaknesses.

‘Take pains, under colour of advocating the existing faith, to represent it in so absurd a light, that none but the very weak can hold it in the literal sense, and that in proportion as men’s minds enlarge, they will take it in a philosophical and figurative sense. Thus, an alarm is excited, and a path is opened over mountains and swamps which could not be removed.

‘You and I know indeed already that the popular faith is nonsense; but the more nonsensical we can make it, the sooner it will be rejected. A strong dose of medi-

cine may carry off with it a smaller portion of morbid matter, which a weak constitution could not else get rid of. Extol religious faith, as independent of evidence and opposed to reason. This will accustom men to the idea that their faith will not stand the test of evidence. We indeed know this already ; but it will greatly accelerate the process to have this habitually impressed on men's minds, by strenuous advocates of their religion, before they are sufficiently enlightened to come to the conclusion by a reasoning process. Their prejudices too are shocked by calling on them to reject their faith as irrational. Since we find men prejudiced, let us begin by enlisting their prejudices, where we can, on our side. Discourage the study of the Scriptures. The half-enlightened, as experience shows, cannot be always brought at once to see them in the right light, and are often confirmed in their faith. But discourage it—not, as some unwise philosophers have done, by decrying, but by extolling. 1st. Represent them as mystical—too sacred for prying curiosity—as parabolical throughout—as likely to do harm, &c. 2nd. Bring up to a level with them an enormous mass of other works—those of the fathers, liturgies, traditions, &c. You may effectually do away the nobility, by conferring it on every one. The ancient warriors took a city, whose walls they could not beat down, by a mound outside. (So also with miracles ; make everything such.) 3rd. Raise other writings a little higher as the completion of what the Evangelists began. As John gave a new Gospel (beyond the first three), so, a newer yet by his successors. 4th. Make these writings (more than any man can read) a necessary interpreter of Scripture : men will not care much to study what they cannot understand without a commentary that is inaccessible.

‘Another advantage from this course is, that you may

thus burden the faith with an indefinite mass of absurdities, which will at length break the back of credulity. Just observation of Paley, that the Reformers did service to Christianity in the matter of Transubstantiation, because "they relieved Christianity of a weight which sunk it." (Your plan, therefore, must be to add on weights). Represent the insufficiency of Scripture to establish without other aids the doctrines that people profess to derive from them. Thus, those other aids will be called in (and let them be left indefinite), to prove, or to explain away, anything whatever. This makes the very foundation of faith something floating and unstable.

'Next, hint that there is a secret doctrine, according to which the initiated understand in a peculiar sense many articles of the vulgar faith. If any one lets out enough of his secret interpretation to shock the prejudices of the vulgar, repudiate and condemn him, and declare that his is not the secret; but never let it be understood that you or any one else has truly declared what the secret is.

'Engage a number of writers, not only real philosophers, but also some sincere bigots, to advocate your views; but never let any one commit you to a responsibility for what he says. Let your writers of pamphlets and treatises be what the Cossacks were to the Russian army—to break the enemy if they could, or, if repulsed, to disperse as they could, without falling back on the main body. Proceed as a general does with the outworks of a fort: as soon as one is taken by the enemy, he fires upon it from the main works. Let out the philosophical explanations of Deity, Trinity, Incarnation, &c., but always have some one at hand to repudiate this. The Nile floods all Egypt, but conceals its course.'

The Archbishop's stay in town was this year very

short, and he soon joined his family-circle at Tenby, where he remained for a time busily engaged in compiling from the newspaper reports of his speeches a general one. Of this the letters which follow treat, with some digressions :—

*To Dr. Hinds, on ‘Church History.’*

‘Dublin: May 5, 1840.

‘My dear Hinds,—We (my family and the Powells) shall set out on Thursday, they going on to Tenby, and I turning off to London, which I may reach either on Saturday or Monday. I expect my motion to come on on Thursday, the 14th.

‘Your sermon is, I conclude, waiting for me in London. I rather regret your having, as you say, omitted all reference to your theory of deacons. It might have come in very briefly, and though not in itself essential, it is connected with some very important views. I did not know it had been controverted.

‘Most persons, indeed—I among the rest,—had been accustomed to take for granted that the seven deacons mentioned were the first, merely from the question having never been raised ; but as soon as it is raised, your account seems so obvious, and the opposite so utterly improbable, that a man who should contend that the seven Grecian deacons are to be regarded as the only ones, might be expected to maintain that the cakes which Sarah baked for the strangers were the first bread ever made, because the first mentioned in the Bible. I have said that your account is connected with an important principle : if, as appears manifest, there were Hebrew deacons before, whose appointment is not recorded, and if, as I think every candid and intelligent reader must perceive, the appointment of the seven is mentioned only incidentally, on account

of Stephen and Philip, this portion of narrative appears of a piece with all the rest of the New Testament, in which there is no distinct record of many institutions, ordinances, forms, practices, &c., which yet we are sure must have existed with the sanction, and some of them by the appointment, of the Apostles themselves. As is remarked concerning Creeds and Liturgies in my “Essay on Omissions,” so also in respect of Church-government: it was evidently designed that each church, in every age, should be left to its own discretion — a serious and considerate discretion—not an *indiscretion*—as to these points ; consequently, the sacred writers not only do not lay down any injunctions as binding on all Christians in all ages, but were not even allowed to make such a record of what they did institute, for the time, in particular churches, as would have practically operated as an injunction. As you have truly observed in another place, when some traditional institution, system, creed, &c., has come down to us, of which great part is probably of apostolical origin, we are to take the whole as a human ordinance, though deserving of attentive and respectful inquiry from its antiquity, and as not designed (else this would have been distinctly stated) to bind all Christians absolutely. If I had, in fact, not the least doubt as to the use of leavened or of unleavened bread by the Apostles in the Eucharist, and as to the posture in which the communicants received it, I should not be bound to conform to their practice, nor to celebrate their love-feasts, &c. In respect of Church-government, this principle is most perniciously lost sight of ; Episcopalians and Presbyterians agreeing to fight out their battle (for a battle they make it, in plain defiance of the plain principle of “following after peace”) on the question whether the one or the other form of government was established in each church which the Apostles founded : the first

and main question being whether they meant that form, whichever it was, to be “an ordinance for ever,” and a model to all Christian churches; and this without delivering any injunction or giving any description relative to it, except the general ones of “orderly” and “edifying” submission to “those that bear rule in the Lord,” and harmonious concord among one another.

‘On opposite sides the same error prevails, with equally baneful effects: in the Presbyterian, when he maintains that “Prelacy is as bad as Popery;” and in the Tractarians, when they disallowed the title of clergy to those not episcopally ordained, excluding each other from the Church of Christ from a supposed non-agreement with the practice of the Apostles in matters wherein they not only did not enjoin conformity in all future ages to their practice, but (supernaturally withheld, as it seems to me) do not even distinctly record what their practice was; but indicated, as plainly as it could be indicated, that while the great doctrines and the spirit of Christianity were to be received always and everywhere as of divine injunction, those other matters of ordinance, government, form, &c., should be left to the discretion—the responsible and careful discretion—of each church in each age and country.

‘By-the-bye, I do not think you ever gave me any opinion on my last volume (perhaps out of modesty, as I quoted so largely from you), which I sent you. I should like to know whether you think that portion of it which is especially directed against the Tractites is likely to do any good. That is now the most rapidly-spreading pestilence, and when it has swallowed up, as it is rapidly doing, the Low Church or Gnostic party, commonly called the Evangelicals, will be, for its appointed day, truly formidable to genuine Christianity.’

*To Dr. Dickinson.*

‘London : May 26.

‘My dear D.,—I received yesterday your two of Friday and Saturday, and I start on Thursday for Tenby. I was at the Birthday Drawing-room yesterday with the Bishop and address. The Queen reads beautifully ; I wish she would teach some of my clergy. The Bishop of —— talked to me spontaneously about the Tractites ; and if you had heard him, you would have thought, but for the voice, that it was I who was speaking. I should not wonder if he were to oppose me to-night. Mr. Ward is to correct the press for me, and furnish notes on the penal colonies. Great attention seems excited to the subject.

‘What sad dawdling about the Education Report ! It is now about two months since it was completed, and more than three since it was announced as just forthcoming. Lord Plunket will arrive in Dublin as soon as this. Could you not collect the clergy to a tea-party on Wednesday week ? Arnold wants to have the law altered which prohibits deacons from secular occupations, in order to have something like our parochial visitors. I should think the way to break the ground would be by a pamphlet in the form of a letter to the bishops. But I shall talk again to the Bishop of Norwich about it. You say nothing of health in your last. I have good accounts from Tenby.

‘Ever yours affectionately,

‘R. D.’

During his stay at Tenby he renewed his intercourse with M. de Sismondi, who was then staying with his wife’s family in the neighbourhood ; and those who survive to remember the pleasant social meet-

ings of that summer, cannot fail to do so with interest. Secondary punishments were much discussed between the two political economists and philanthropists ; M. de Sismondi being inclined to be a little biassed by his own recollections of various imprisonments in Geneva and Italy—first as an aristocrat in the old Revolution, then as a democrat by the Austrians ; while the Archbishop held steadily to his main principle, that the end of punishment is, primarily, simply the prevention of crime ; though as subservient to that, of course, every means should be used to reform the criminal.

M. de Sismondi had, from his own recollections, a peculiar horror of solitary confinement, and the various systems tried and pursued in different countries were often made subjects of discussion.

‘ June 6, 1840.

‘ My dear Senior,—I am working hard, but advancing slowly. I find the compiling from the newspaper reports—including the incorporating of the Reply—slower work than original composition ; and I have also to collect and arrange several notes. To fill up the slight heads, which in many places are all that the reporters give, and to improve the arrangement and expression, is a delicate task. I have accordingly resolved not to interrupt myself in it, but to keep at it steadily (bating, of course, the unavoidable interruption of Irish letters) till finished. With my intellectual constitution, if I were to break off and come to town to speak about corn-laws, I should make but a poor hand of *that*, because it would take more time than would be allowed me to bring my thoughts into a new train ; and then, there would be much time and difficulty in bringing them back again to my present work, and I should either perform *this* badly, or delay it till the public interest had died away—most likely both. I am

really sorry not to have been able to lend a hand, slight as the advantage would probably have been, against the Corn-laws. And I had designed to come up, after having finished, as I had hoped, the work before me. But I find this quite impossible; and it is better to have a chance of doing one thing tolerably well, than to attempt two at once and fail in both.'

'Tenby: July 4, 1840.

'My dear Senior,—I propose to start for Waterford on Thursday or Friday morning.

'Sismondi is here, with his wife and her very agreeable sisters. Of course I have crammed him with penal colonies. I have resolved in stealing your copy of the "Statesman," unless you particularly want my pencil-marks in it, in which case I will restore it from Dublin. I little anticipated so long a job in the speech; but I am pretty well satisfied with it, as far as I can judge from a manuscript. Did the division on the Corn-laws equal your hopes?

'Weather wet, windy, woful.'

The first letter we find after his return to Ireland, is a fragment to Lady Osborne, apparently in reply to one of hers, expressing a fear that he would look on her praying for him as a mark of enthusiasm. The reply gives very fully his views on the subject:—

*To Lady Osborne.*

'How could you, my dear madam, suspect that I should censure you for enthusiasm for remembering me in your prayers, and for praying that I may obtain the approbation and support of sincere Christians? We are by no means restricted, in our private devotions, to the words or

to the topics of the Liturgy ; but are we not, even there, expressly taught to pray repeatedly “ that all professed Christians may agree in the truth, and live in unity and godly love ” ? It is with hesitation and qualification that we venture to pray for anything that is entirely unconnected with our own exertions, such as fair winds or fruitful seasons, &c. I do not know that there is a single petition in the Lord’s Prayer which is not to be accompanied with efforts of our own. But while you are praying for mutual love and concord among Christians, you are also labouring to promote it.

‘ Thank you for what you are so good as to say about Sismondi’s book ; but as I am now in the midst of book-sellers, it will be the least trouble to procure it here. When I read a good many Trinitarian writers, I sometimes wonder that there should not be more Socinians than there are. There is much scholastic metaphysics afloat, which I would put into the hands, by choice, of any one whom I wished to regard the doctrine of the Trinity as an absurd device of the schoolmen. By-the-bye, a lady who had been a Socinian, accidentally read the dissertation on the word “ Person ” in the Appendix to the “ Logic,” which changed her views, and she is now a member of our church. I wish you could get Sismondi to read Hinds’ “ Three Temples.” It is the most scriptural work on the subject that I know.’

*To the Bishop of Norwich.*

‘ Dublin : October 4, 1840.

‘ My dear Lord,—I returned last night from a confirmation tour in Ferns and Leighlin (the bishop being incapable), in which I confirmed, at eleven places, 1843 persons. Pretty well for our sinecure Church !

‘I shall order a great cargo of your pamphlets for distribution among the clergy here. It was an unexpected pleasure to me to receive it, as I feared you would rest satisfied with the publication of the debate in the two pamphlets (Mr. Hull’s), and the “Appeal for Church Government;” both of which, by-the-bye, I suppose you have seen. Both are well written, and I have been giving them what circulation I can, as I wish people to see what is said by others as well as by myself.

‘Your lordship’s publication seems to me a model of dignified forbearance. While you were cannonaded at a distance with generalities, you appeared to have the worst of it, to such an audience as the House of Lords, but on coming to close quarters—entering into particulars—your victory is complete; and yet there is not a sign of that acrimony with which you were assailed. It is the very picture of the Lacedemonian phalanx, enduring an almost overwhelming shower of missiles, crushing all resistance when they come within pike’s length, marching calmly to the sound of the flute, and scorning to pursue a routed enemy.

‘Ever, my dear Lord, most truly yours,

‘R. DUBLIN.’

The next letter refers to the promotion of his valued friend and chaplain, Dr. Dickinson, to the bishopric of Meath. This promotion, though one which gave the most lively pleasure to the Archbishop, was not, as was generally supposed, the result of his application. The Rev. Dr. West succeeded as the Archbishop’s chaplain.

‘I dare say,’ he writes in a notebook, in which he occasionally recorded his thoughts on passing events, ‘most people supposed, and perhaps many do still, that I had been urgently pressing his claims on Government, and

writing and speaking to every one concerned, to get him raised to the Bench. How little such persons know me or him! Of course if I had been asked to recommend, I should have done so; but they could have no motive for this, latterly at least, as they could not doubt whom I should fix on. And that being the case, my urging his claims would have been asking a *personal favour*—a thing I never did, nor will, from any ministry. For as soon as I should have contracted an obligation to a minister I should have put it out of my power to act rightly; I must then either have sacrificed my independent judgment, and all the influence fairly arising thence—advantages for which I am responsible—or else I must, by acting occasionally against the minister, incur the imputation of ingratitude and treachery; and not altogether undeservedly, inasmuch as I could not deny knowing what it is that ministers, when they confer an obligation, expect in return. They regard the man, in short, as *bought*, on whom they confer a favour. He who knows or believes this to be the case, sells himself when he accepts one; and he who has sold himself has thenceforward only the alternative of being a slave or a cheat. “*Dame qui prend, tout se rend.*” ’

But though the Archbishop was thus firm and consistent in the course he had laid down for himself—never to *ask* promotion, even for the most valued friends—he nevertheless was always ready to give them opportunities of recommending themselves by making known their abilities and powers, and affording them occasions to bring these into play. A friend remembers accompanying the Archbishop and Dr. Dickinson—a few years earlier than the date before us—to the Irish Office, where the Archbishop was soon engaged in close conference with two of the ministry who happened to be present, while Dr. Dickin-

son and the narrator remained in another part of the room. Presently the Archbishop cried out suddenly, 'Why, here we are talking of Irish affairs, and there is a person in the room who knows more of them than all of us put together!' and he called on Dr. Dickinson to come forward, and engaged him in the conversation which was going on, so as to give him an opportunity of showing his thorough acquaintance with the subject.

The address of congratulation to Dr. Dickinson on his appointment was originated without the Archbishop's knowledge, and signed by a very large majority of the clergy of the diocese.

*To the Bishop of Norwich.*

'Dublin: November 24, 1840.

'My dear Lord,—I cannot refrain from thanking you for your kind recollection of me when you were writing to Dr. Dickinson.

'I do, of course, feel a great loss in him; and, as Bacon says, the inconvenience is greater, and the convenience less, on account of the novelty. But I have no doubt I shall feel more and more the gain of an ally on the Irish Bench.

'Independently of that, however, I were most selfish not to rejoice in the benefit to the Church, of seeing such a man put in his proper place, precisely because it is his proper place. If bishoprics were to be had for asking, and not without, neither he nor I should have been where we are.

'The appointment is generally applauded. Even the adversaries of the Education Board have no fault to find with him, except that he is not one; and it is not so strange that ministers should now and then appoint a man

who supports their most important measures, as that they should ever have done otherwise.

‘It ought to be known that Lord Morpeth acknowledges he had long had Dickinson in his eye; so that we may conclude he deserved a large share of the credit. And it should also be known that he spontaneously offered the living (Dr. D.’s) of Anne’s (in my gift, but of course claimable by Government) to Mr. West, the curate (now my chaplain and secretary) to whom I had promised it.

‘This is like himself. With kind regards,

‘Ever, my dear Lord, yours most truly,

‘R. DUBLIN.’

A dissolution of Parliament had brought round his turn again to be in London, on which he wrote as follows to Mr. Senior :—

‘November 30, 1840.

‘My dear Senior,—We shall most gladly receive your party and —— at Dublin, more especially as we do not think of coming to London for the session. I may perhaps come over by myself for a week, if any question should arise that especially calls for me; but there is so little done in a single session that it is by no means worth the sacrifice. As for the Education Board, that will be far better defended by Lord Morpeth than it could by me, even if I were constantly in the House; because he is a member of the administrative fund, and he has been since his appointment as commissioner a very regular attendant. No greater improvement could have been introduced into our Constitution. For want of it the whole question has been considered more as a contest between myself and Phillpotts, than as one in which Government were fully embarked. John Tuam is very active against us, and has

gained over, I understand, the Cardinals ; but still I have no great fears of the system being formally disallowed by the Pope, even by a future Pope, who shall be one of those very Cardinals, but who will hesitate to take so strong a step as *Pope*. I think the system will go on and take more and more root in the minds of the people, till the Tories come in ; but then I fear confidence will be withdrawn from it, and John Tuam will carry his point. I have heard from Sieveking, who has sent over copies of the Latin treatise he got printed at Frankfort. You can get a copy of Fellowes. Of course you will send him, or any one else, copies of “Whately on Shakspeare,” of which you are firmly entitled to as many as you wish. Lord Plunket is greatly interested by your part of the work.

‘Your account of your tour is indeed most cheering. We have not resolved on anything for next summer. All will depend upon what the medical men say of ——. If compelled to go abroad, it will perhaps be as good or better for her to remain fixed in one place, if we could find one that would suit us ; but I don’t think in all our travels we saw any place where we should at all like to remain. To me it is indifferent, provided we do not stay in a *valley*—the only situation that disagrees with me. I have no objection to the act of travelling ; what I miss is something to do, some *ἔργον* to accomplish. I have outlived the power of being amused, *passively*, for more than a day or two at a time. I have been too long an actor to endure being a spectator long together, however splendid the scenes, and excellent the performance. Perhaps if I were no longer Archbishop, I might spend my time very happily in writing books ; but I must have something to *accomplish*, else I should feel much as Napoleon did in St. Helena, and as he *would* have equally felt had he had the whole world to

wander over, supposing he could have been effectually bound to continue a mere spectator, with nothing to *do* but to *see*, read, converse, &c. The difference between him and me, of his seeking glory and power for himself, and I some public benefit, does not affect the present question. But it adds to my discomfort when abroad to be always suspecting (as experience has lately shown, not without reason) that something will be going wrong in my absence. Dickinson made a speech at the Lord Mayor's, at a meeting respecting emigration, dissuading settlers from the penal colonies ; and the report of it has reached Frankfort, London, and Edinburgh, and has called forth angry letters, of which the publication is threatened, from persons interested in those delectable regions. A spark seems to have fired the train I have been so long laying. The demons begin to cry out, and we may hope will be ejected.'

*Extract from a Letter to the Bishop of Norwich.*

'Dublin : December 19, 1840.

'I am glad you seem to entertain those cheering views in the midst of your discouragements, which I endeavoured to express in my last two charges.

'Some consider me (though my temper is the reverse) as very sanguine, because I always attempt whatever has even a slight prospect of success, and am never disheartened by failure. But the fact is, I never do fail ; for my orders are, not to conquer, but only to fight ; and whenever I do happen to conquer also, that is so much over and above.

'Though you might suppose me to be overflowing with leisure, from my bestowing so much of my tediousness on you, it is only because, having pen in hand, I do not like to leave unsaid what occurs to me ; but I have

now two sermons in the stocks, besides an examination for orders. I have not time therefore to read, except by proxy. Mrs. W. has been reading Gladstone for me. She says he begins in a moderate and rational style, proceeds to some startling and revolting conclusions, and then (like the doctor who ordered the ice to be warmed) concludes by neutralising all he had been saying, and leaves you just as wise as before you opened his book. I am meditating a very important work, in which, as it will be a work of many hands, you may perhaps find me some assistants. I am proposing to set several persons to work to compose an Index to the Oxford Tracts, including the remains of Froude, Newman's Arians, and other avowed publications of the avowed Tractites. It is quite right that the whole series should be brought up before the tribunal of the public as a whole. Their policy is, to obtain for each tract whatever influence it may derive, not only from its intrinsic merits, but from its being part of a series, coming out under the sanction of a certain committee, or whatever it may be called (which is quite fair); but then (which is quite unfair), if the tract be refuted or objected to, to disown it, as "the work of a very young man," for which no one is at all responsible but the individual author, and our judgment of which is not at all to affect the general character of the tracts. Now this may be called "playing fast and loose."

'The "Lessons on Evidences" have been translated into French by a lady at Lausanne, and Fellowes has some copies for sale. It is very well done. There is an Italian version just about to be printed at Brussels. Perhaps your son can learn whether any could be usefully conveyed to the Greek Islands.'

The following letter (to Dr. Hinds) alludes to the Arch-

bishop's views on the much-disputed passage, 'Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them,' &c. He always considered this passage as relating to offences punishable by the religious community, the Church, not to sins against God. At a later period he developed these views more fully in his work, 'The Kingdom of Christ.'

The postscript relates to a literary effort which, though trifling in itself, was interesting to him. His fondness for fairy-tales and fairy mythology, a branch of romantic literature generally despised by all but the very young, was characteristic of his mind. A good fairy-tale never lost its charm for him ; and the outlines of the pretty little stories which occur in Mrs. Whately's tale, 'Reverses,' were furnished by him. The 'Tales of the Genii' had been old favourites of his youth ; he would often repeat from memory striking passages in them, which illustrated special truths he was explaining, and he had always regretted that the book was one whose character in some respects made it objectionable for young people. It was at his suggestion, therefore, that Mrs. Whately undertook to revise and alter the tales so as to make them fit for the perusal of young people. This was done in so successful a manner, that some good judges considered the literary merit of the work increased ; but being, unfortunately, published under the old title, which did not imply any alteration, this little book has been less known than it deserved. He was always ready to answer the scruples of many excellent persons against fictions, by observing that the imagination has been given us by God, and that as He has seen fit to bestow it, it must assuredly be intended to be employed ; and the very examples of the use of parables in Scripture show that fictitious narrative is sanctioned by Him : that a judicious

selection is at all times to be preferred to a system of exclusion, and that young persons, if too severely restrained from gratifying so strong a natural taste, may indemnify themselves, when older, by an indiscriminate and hurtful indulgence of it :—

‘ December 25, 1840.

‘ My dear H.,—I have been to-day *sledge-hammering* your idea about Simeon into a sermon. It does well.

‘ I think you have come round very nearly to my view about remission—*i.e.*, not absolute remission of sins (though they ARE sins against God) *as* sins against God, but as excluding from the Church.

‘ P.S.—Do you know the purified “Tales of the Genii,” edited by Mrs. W.? (not with her name).’

The last letter we give for this year is one whose date is uncertain, but may probably be referred to this period ; it is an answer to one who wrote to ask the Archbishop’s advice on some points which troubled his mind :—

‘ The promise of Christ to be with His Church always, and that His Spirit should lead them into all (the) truth, might naturally have led to the expectation that no errors should ever find their way into any Christian Church. And when, after the departure of the Apostles, various different opinions prevailed, of which some must be false, this might have shaken men’s faith in Christ’s promise, and led them to think He had deserted them, or had all along deceived them, supposing no such varieties had arisen while the Apostles were on earth. But we know they did, in opposition to the efforts of the Apostles. Of course this proved that the promise of Christ did not extend to the prevention of all inroads of error ; and that, as in the Apostles’ time, so afterwards, false notions were to be expected. Now in their time the appeal to their

miracles proved that they were right, and their opponents wrong. In after-times a like appeal has been set up by many. They are quite consistent in requiring assent to such evidence: When I see any one work miracles, I will believe him.

‘But setting this aside, what was the test, when the Apostles were gone, which was the true, and which the false faith? The decision of the Church, to be sure. And what is the Church? Evidently the majority. All questions were canvassed in councils, and the decision was that of the majority, like a vote in the House of Commons. In fact, the Roman Catholics, since they exclude the Greek Church, are but a small majority; but I admit that the chief part of their doctrines and practices are, and have long been, those of a great majority of professing Christians. And now, how are we to know that the majority are always right? Orthodox, in the common acceptation, they cannot but be; for the opinion of the majority will always be right, *i.e.* orthodox, in the eyes of that majority. But how do we know that this will be found orthodox at the day of judgment? The majority of the Israelites were for the golden calf—five out of six of the spies brought up an ill report of the Holy Land. The majority of the Jews (including most of their fathers, who declared what they said had always been the received right interpretation of their Scriptures) rejected the claims of Jesus. And the Mahometans outnumber the Christians. And all this is natural. A religion framed or perverted by man is likely to be more popular than one which is calculated to improve and change our nature. A coat made to measure sits easier than one which is ready-made, and requires the body to be fitted to the coat.

‘What, then, are we to be left to? Private judgment. Is each to examine Scripture for himself, and decide for

himself what is the true interpretation of each part? Do you not see how weak and fallible human reason is, since learned and able men have differed from each other, therefore some of them, at least, from truth? Surely it is the part of Christian humility to disparage our own judgment and our powers of reasoning—of sifting evidence—and of interpreting Scripture, and to embrace in faith whatever the infallible guide, the Church Catholic, has decided.

‘Very well: I will renounce all reliance on my own powers, and resign myself to the infallible guide—when I can find it. But bring me no texts of Scripture to prove that the Roman Church is so; no appeals to the fathers—no historical proofs—no reasonings of any kind. You have told me I am incapable of all this; that my reasoning and judging powers are not to be trusted. To put arguments before me, is to show a book to a blind man. It is to send me a long voyage in search of a compass, because I cannot sail without a compass. Nothing but a sensible miracle exhibited to myself can make me or any one else, consistently, a Roman Catholic.

‘Accordingly, the thinking part of them usually believe merely that their religion is the most convenient for keeping the vulgar quiet; but as for its truth, they embrace these two fundamental propositions: 1st, that God never would (or indeed could, properly speaking) give a revelation without giving also an infallible guide for its right interpretation, always at hand, and acceptable to all, as an indispensable remedy for the weakness of our faculties and uncertainty of our judgment; 2ndly, that therefore we ought not to reason, inquire, judge, or, in short, employ our own faculties at all in deciding any religious question, but rely wholly on an infallible guide.

‘From these two positions, which are fundamentals of Romanism, follows the destruction of all the rest. That

Church saws off the bough she stands on. For it follows inevitably (and this is the belief of the most intelligent members of the Church) that God never has given a revelation (unless to any who may have experienced a sensible miracle), and that He never can, unless proved by a miracle to each individual who is to receive it. For as to the evidence of miracles having been displayed to others, that is a matter of judgment (by hypothesis) in religious matters.

‘This view goes to the root of the matter, which is what few Protestants understand, and hence they are often worsted in controversy, and often write Romanism without knowing it. And this explains (what I learned from B. White) why so many Roman Catholics who are deists or atheists never think of inquiring into the evidence of any form of Christianity. The above propositions prove *à priori* that there cannot be a revelation.’

## CHAPTER XV.

1841.

Letter to Mr. Senior on the merits of two anonymous personages—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Letter to Miss Crabtree on a mathematical question—Accident to Mrs. Whately—Letter to Bishop of Llandaff—Letter to Mr. Senior on 'Tract No. 90'—Interview with Dr. Pusey—Death of his friend Blanco White—Visits Ems with his family—Letter to Dr. West—Letter to Bishop of Norwich—Returns to Ireland—Letter to Mr. Senior on Irish Education—Letter on same subject.

THE earliest letters on our list for this year need little or no explanation. The lively description of two personages, on whose merits Mr. Senior had been questioning the Archbishop, is truly characteristic.

The letter to Miss Crabtree (February 23) is apparently on some mathematical question she had put before the Archbishop. He always shrank from giving an authoritative decision on matters of this kind :—

*To N. Senior, Esq.*

‘Palace : January 4, 1841.

‘My dear S.,—It is very curious that, of all possible mistakes, the *learning* of —— and the activity of —— should be celebrated in England ; the remarkably illiterate character of the one (who does not even pretend not to hate the very sight of a book), and the apathetic sluggishness of the other, being here a common joke. —— is a *member* of several boards ; and, what is more, he often attends *at* them (not *to* them) ; and hence the mistake.

He will sit you for two or three hours, present in body, though absent in mind—"avec l'air d'un mouton qui rêve." And if you address a remark or question to him, you will find he knows as much of what has been going on as the aforesaid sheep; but when roused to attention, he will make shrewd remarks, and often give sound judgments; for he really is a man of a fair degree of intelligence, though, to be sure ———, if "sawn into quantities," would make half a dozen of him. His apparently stupid apathy, which leads some at the first interview to *underrate* him, makes others, afterwards, to *overrate* him; for it is like the "locutus bos" of Livy. If you were to hear an ox utter a sensible remark, your astonishment would set it off, and it would seem not only prodigious, but prodigiously wise; and, moreover, you would not know what he might say next, if the humour took him; you might guess that he knew all things, and if he would but speak more, might instruct the world. Another cause is, that he has a way of saying, "I quite agree with you;" and Swift remarks that "the short way to obtain the reputation of a sensible man is, when any one tells you his opinion, to agree with him." Yes, (you will perhaps answer), a short way to gain it, and a short way to *lose* it again; since such a man's word must often contradict his actions, and each other. So I should have thought, *à priori*, but much depends on whom you have to deal with. "Old birds," they say, "are not caught with chaff," but I suppose young ones are. I remember, soon after I came here, having occasion to point out a very objectionable passage in a sermon of ———'s (entering on politics), and he "quite agreed with me," but next week published the sermon as it was. Thenceforward I knew him, so far; and before long, I knew him "intus et in cute." But there are many who have long had dealings with him, and

yet have not found him out. These are right in reckoning him a superior man ; for superior to *them* he surely is. If Ministers trust him not to take any steps that may benefit himself, though all the Whigs in the empire were to be hanged fifty cubits high, they will be acting against the knowledge of him which they ought to have acquired, and easily may. They fancy him a man of steady Whig principles. Heaven knows, he is pretty steady to his own principle, which is, to provide for his own interest ! I never knew him act independently as to that principle. Those are equally mistaken who calculate on ——'s steady support of ministers. They ought to be aware, for it is no secret, that he was prepared to oppose the tithe-bills, tooth and nail ; only it happened not to come on while he was in Parliament. He is somewhat open to love of popularity with those immediately around him, and has, I fear, too little principle to guard him against the effects.

‘ He has never opposed the Education Board ; but he has not, that I can learn, made any vigorous exertions in its favour.

‘ He is, like the other, a good-humoured character ; and likes, when he can, though not so unblushingly, to say and do at the moment whatever is likely to be acceptable to the persons present. On the whole, I do not think either of them much more to be depended on by a party than ——, or myself. The two last will not support any ministerial measure where conscientious principle interferes, and self-interest or love of popularity may exercise a like interference in the case of the others.’

*To Bishop Copleston.*

‘ Dublin : February 5, 1841.

‘ —— is accounted, by the most competent judges here, an author rather to be referred to than read, being

chiefly an indefatigable searcher in books ; a man pretty strong in “simplex apprehensio,” weak in “judicium,” and stark nought in “argumenta.” I have not read him or —— on this subject, though the latter appears, from what I have read, to be decidedly clear, only eaten up with conceit. —— is a man who first makes up his mind (soon made up, as being very small), and then seeks for reasons ; of course, if he chance to stumble on a good one, not rejecting it ; but he is not implicitly to be trusted even in his statements of facts. I do not mean that he would absolutely fabricate ; but I have known him put forth (when on his own side) the greatest misstatements, which he could easily have ascertained to be such. In religion he is, in all essential points, a Papist ; only, like Henry VIII., he would like to be himself Pope. The most offensive doctrines, including persecution, he does not disavow. Though a bitter enemy of the Roman Catholics, he is yet one degree more bitter against all Protestants, including many members of his own Church, who do not coincide with his views. Of course it would not suit their views to go to the *root* of the controversy, which lies in those points common to the Church of Rome and the Oxford Tractites ; a party whose origin I partly foresaw and foretold, with a delineation of its characteristics, in the “Errors of Romanism.” ’

*To Miss Crabtree.*

‘ Dublin : February 23, 1841.

‘ My dear Miss Crabtree,—Thank you for the letters. I shall consult —— again, or some other who knows the subject well. I mention this—and I mentioned it before—to clear myself of the presumption (which I think it would be) of making decisions on any subject which I do not

profess to be a proficient in. And you, I think, would not infer from this that I consider mathematics as a subject in which questions are to be “decided by authority!” I dare say you are even in the habit of consulting the almanac to know when there will be a new moon, without the least idea that the motions of the heavenly bodies are not susceptible of exact calculations, or that questions of astronomy are to be decided by “authority.”

‘At present, having had no time for a very slight glance, it strikes me that the way I and everybody else judge of the probability of a conclusion, is just the same, as far as we have data to proceed on, as insurance offices use. For instance, “of men that have such-and-such symptoms, on the average, so many per cent. have the plague,” and so many per cent. of plague-patients die, &c.

‘As for the data, insurance offices themselves are more or less correct according as the statistical reports are full and accurate. The Norwich Insurance Office, either from erroneous information, or from increased duration of life since it was founded, had for several years charged too high a premium, having underrated the chances of life; and they have thus an enormous accumulation of capital, which they know not what to do with.

‘I cannot believe that any one, 1st, considers a probable argument as good for nothing; 2nd, or again that all such arguments are equally probable; 3rd, or again that two or three such arguments, leading to the same conclusion, are, together, of no greater force than one of them alone. Then surely there must be a mode of computing their joint force.’

The letters which follow allude to a severe accident of Mrs. Whately, who was long laid up in consequence of a

compound fracture of the leg, which threatened serious effects on her health. This anxiety suggested the following characteristic letter to Bishop Copleston :—

‘March 7, 1841.

‘My dear Lord,—Mrs. W., I am happy to say, is going on as favourably as we could venture to hope, but of course has suffered and must suffer much. It was a fortnight before she could be lifted out of bed to have it made.

‘Once before I had worse news to give of her, when for about three weeks she was wavering between life and death in the typhus-fever at Halesworth ; “And whether she’d live or die, why the doctors didn’t know.” She has suffered less than I had feared, of her old enemy, palpitation, which always comes at the back of every other assailant, bodily or mental ; like the Helots of old, who were sure to make an insurrection when there was an earthquake, or a foreign war, or any other trouble at hand.

‘What a strange thing it is, that there are so many different kinds of bodily suffering, and some of them among the most severe, which we never call *pain* ; and yet there are different kinds of pain too ! What can be the differentia that belongs to all that we call “pain,” and which is absent from these other sensations, which no one calls pains, but yet very disagreeable : *e.g.* nausea, sense of suffocation, nervous agitation, &c., and among others—what I believe is among the most dreadful, though I know it only by what I see in others, and hear them describe—that palpitation ?

‘It is, as you say, a double trial of one’s firmness, when the things to be borne are such as one cannot try or wish to be indifferent about. Opposition from

enemies or strangers, obloquy or contempt from those one wishes to esteem, perverseness or folly in those from whom one has no reason to expect anything better, and the like, are things which to some people (as far as I can judge by observation of them) are no trial of any consequence. I suppose those who have what the phrenologists call the organ of firmness much developed, receive a positive gratification from its exercise, and ditto with the organ of combativeness. My natural endowments on those points are but small ; and I believe it is, universally, more easy to acquire a habit of acting like than of feeling like a person of such natural endowments.

‘ It is commonly said at Oxford, at least used to be, that it was next to impossible to make a Wykehamist believe that any examination could be harder than that which the candidates for New College undergo.

‘ Now it is about equally difficult to convince me, that any one can have a greater or more painful effort to make than myself in acquiring a habit of firmness. In this, however, I may conceivably be mistaken ; and whether I am or not, no one can ever decide, since no one can feel what is within another’s breast. But in this I am a competent judge, that no *earthly* object could ever repay me for the labour and the anguish of remodelling my nature in these respects. I have succeeded so far that I have even found myself standing firm when some men of constitutional intrepidity have given way ; and, indeed, I have heard seamen say that if a mast is well spliced, it will sooner break anywhere else than there. I feel that I can trust this splice in my character ; but this I may safely say, that if any one whom I conceived to be of just such a constitution as mine, but who had no thought or belief of another world, were to consult me whether, with a view to worldly objects alone, it were worth his while

to attempt the conquest of timidity, irresolution, bashfulness, sensitiveness to public opinion, and other such dispositions, and whether, if he achieved this conquest, and made a creditable and thoroughly prosperous career in some public station, he would be repaid for his efforts and suffering, I should answer at once in the negative, and should recommend (supposing, all along, the present world alone to be considered) that he should take the “*fallentis semita vitæ . . . nunc veterum libris, nunc somno et inertibus horis,*” &c. The process of mental *case-hardening*, I should tell him, is more pain than Aladdin’s lamp and ring would repay.’

It was just about this time that the appearance of ‘Tract No. 90’ had created a universal excitement among all in any way interested in theological controversy. He writes to Mr. Senior on the subject :—

‘Dublin: April 2, 1841.

‘My dear Senior,—The Bishop of Norwich has sent me a very able and well-written pamphlet by Prebendary Wodehouse, on Subscription, and in favour of Church Government, and he is anxious to have it reviewed. I should think, in conjunction with the Bishop of N.’s own speech and the “appeal,” an article might be made on it, which would be very interesting at this time, when all Oxford is in a ferment about Tract No. 90. He suggested to me to apply to you thereupon. If you think there is any hope of getting an article from yourself, or from any one you know, inserted in any review, perhaps you had better see the bishop about it. Just at this crisis a good hard thrust might thoroughly overthrow the party. .

‘Ever yours,

‘R. WHATELY.’

The next letter is in answer to a request for an article, probably on the same subject. He was still engaged in superintending translations of the 'Evidences' in different languages. He lived to see it in twelve or fourteen :—

‘ April 10, 1841.

‘ My dear Senior,—I could not trust ——’s directions, but I will try to get an article by a better hand, if you think you can make interest to get it inserted. I shall try Hinds first, and some others if he refuses. It is curious that the very day after yours arrived, I received a letter from a clergyman at Pisa, suggesting an Italian version of the “Evidences,” for which he thinks he can give circulation. It is provoking that there should be a demand and a supply, and yet they cannot be brought to meet.

I do not know to what extent Government have interfered in respect of poor-law offices here, but I suppose neither ministers nor commissioners could refuse to favour in the appointments those who took a prominent part in the contest about the bill.

‘ It is one of the evils of any measure (supposing it ever so good in itself) that is carried by such means as that was, that you in great measure preclude yourself from employing creditable instruments. If the truest religion is propagated by force, reprobate dragoons and their companions must be your missionaries ; if you smuggle in the best commodities, the dealers will be reprobate sailors and ruffians, &c.’

It was in this year that he had an interview with Dr. Pusey, at Brighton, which, as it has been grossly misrepresented, and stated as having taken place under different

circumstances and at a much earlier period, may need to be explained here.

They met as old college associates, on the most friendly terms. Dr. Pusey, in the course of the interview, asked the Archbishop's permission to preach in his diocese. The Archbishop told him, candidly, he dreaded his introducing novelties. 'Not novelties,' replied the other. 'Well, if you will, antiquities,' said the Archbishop. Dr. Pusey requested him to name some examples of these 'antiquated novelties,' and he instanced the practice lately introduced of mixing water with wine at the communion. Dr. Pusey excused the practice by observing that at the early communion complaints had been made that the wine affected the heads of the communicants! The Archbishop exclaimed, 'Oh! Pusey, you cannot be serious;' and at last he added, in his own account of the conversation, 'I fairly made him laugh.'

It was about this time that the news reached the Archbishop of the death of his friend Mr. B. White, an event which could not be unexpected to those who knew how long and severe had been his bodily sufferings for years.

In the summer, Mrs. Whately being sufficiently recovered to travel, the family removed first to Brighton, and then to Ems, whose waters had been prescribed for some of the party. The narrow and confined, though picturesque, valley of the Lahn had, however, an unfavourable effect on the Archbishop's health, and at the end of a fortnight he returned to England, leaving his family to follow when the 'cure' was completed.

The following letter to Dr. West (now his chaplain in Bishop Dickinson's stead), describes his impressions of Ems :—

*To Dr. West.*

‘Nassau : July 21, 1841.

‘My dear West,—I send you a view of our “happy valley.” It is very pretty—I dare say as much so as Rasselas’s; and I would, if I had enough bodily energy left, dig a hole in the mountain, like him, rather than live in a valley. I do not think, however, that I have as yet suffered quite so much as I have in others. Mr. and Mrs. Henry Taylor are here, as agreeable as I had expected. She is beautiful, and very pleasing. He has read the “Bishop,” and thinks it very clever, but not agreeable in style. He says Bishop Stanley was much taken with it, and had been inquiring of all the bishops to find out the author. Senior also has read it, and with approbation. The chief censure I have heard pronounced on it is, that if a man does not know better than to need such advice, he must be incapable of profiting by it. Now, as the same may be said of nearly all the advice that ever has or will be given—*e.g.*, all sermons, charges, &c. (including Paul’s to Timothy; for one might say, could Timothy *want to be told* that a bishop ought not to be a brawling drunkard?)—this is a matter for serious consideration; not least for me and my brother of Meath. Shall we spare ourselves (I this year, and he next) the trouble of writing charges? If not, pray turn in your mind (and in his) what I shall say, as the time draws near. The company mostly go and return to church and everywhere else on donkeys, which are in vogue for all ranks and sexes. There was ——— mounted on another ass. It is the Queen of Greece (not Russia) that is here. There are multitudes here of huge *orange-coloured* slugs; shall I bring over some to fill sinecure places in Ireland? The papers speak of Lord Lansdowne as detained by illness at Liege.

On Sunday, Cox came over to consult about the index. He has a great part, but not the whole, of Mr. Croly's; he is willing to enter into direct communication with him, and thinks he can make such additions (having read *all* the tracts as they came out, and also the other works of the authors) that they, two together, will produce a valuable work. His direction is Godesberg, near Bonn, Rhine. You may communicate with him on Croly's behalf. Croly need not be ashamed of using his aid, for he is a very intelligent man, and quite *up* to the subject, having been all along on the spot.'

On the Archbishop's return to Ireland, a new source of anxiety with respect to public affairs began. The Ministry had changed,<sup>1</sup> after an unusually long period of Whig administration, and he was anxiously concerned to know how this would affect the Education scheme, which had been commenced and carried on under the Whigs. He immediately wrote to the Lord-Lieutenant, laying before him the state of the case, and declaring that unless the measure was decidedly and openly supported by Government, he could not remain a commissioner.

The letters which follow explain the rest :—

‘November 10, 1841.

‘My dear Senior,—Soon after my letter was sent in to the —— he went to England, leaving it behind him unread, only with a general knowledge that it related to the Education Board; which I suppose he had been taught to regard as a matter that would keep cold, and which he might settle by himself without consulting the English Government. If so, they did not in-

<sup>1</sup> Lord Melbourne resigned, and Sir R. Peel became Prime Minister, in September 1841. The latter retained office until June 1846.

struct him well in the requisitions of his office. While in England a rumour reached him that I intended to resign, on which he wrote to deprecate the step, and to state what is above. I sent him a copy of my letter, which he answered by saying that Ministers had not had time to make up their minds, &c., all in the cautious style which has procured —— the title of “the Veiled Prophet.” I replied that I had no wish to urge Ministers to any premature decision as to their approval or disapproval either of the system in itself, or of myself as one of its administrators, but that it was important there should be as little unnecessary delay as possible, because agitating doubts and suspicions would fill the public mind and gain strength every day. And so rests that. But —— when I dined there t’other day, openly and spontaneously questioned me about the system, evincing a favourable disposition. The chaplains are a curious medley, and four-fifths of them agree (while agreeing in hardly anything else) in having been strenuous opponents of the Board. On the other hand, I hear it said that Lord —— has declared that he will not endure any tampering with it by Government, and this seems probable.

‘The Bishop and Clergy of —— have presented a eulogistic address to the Primate, begging his advice as to what steps they should take relative to National Education, and he in reply entreats them to take none, but leave matters in the hands of Ministers. If he says this without having had any communication with Ministers, it is very satisfactory, implying that Lord Stanley’s system, which was ungodly and mischievous when —— acted with a Whig ministry, may become wise and good when —— joins the Tories; but if it be that he speaks as having had communication with Ministers, and that they mean to tamper with the system so as to satisfy

its former opponents, it is all over with it. If they propose the smallest alteration (however insignificant in itself), *that* will be the signal, not only to McHale, but to the crowd of other agitators who are waiting for occasions to oppose any ministerial measure, but are ashamed to oppose the Board which they had so long supported, as long as it remains exactly on the same footing. Any such attempt, therefore, I shall regard (especially after the warning I have given) as my dismissal.'

‘Palace : November 15, 1841.

‘My dear Lord,—Many thanks for your kindness in executing my commission.

‘You are quite right in what you say of the Tractites. “The horse is not quite escaped who drags his halter.” Our Church, in breaking loose from Romish corruption, carried off a piece of the halter. *Their* object is to get hold of the end of the halter; so as to lead off the horse captive, not back to his old stable, but to one of their own, much like it, in which he is to be hoodwinked and grind in their mill.

‘My object is to disengage his neck from the halter, without (as some reformers have done) tearing it off so roughly as to tear off hair, and skin, and flesh with it.

‘Our Church is at present like the feet of Nebuchadnezzar’s image, partly of iron, and part (though by no means half)—only a small part—of clay. I would substitute iron for the clay, and the clay for the iron.

‘I have not seen the notice of the Bishop of Winchester’s charge.

‘The —— has been much lauded by some, for one of his; in which he censures No. 90, yet says that tradition is the appointed interpreter of Scripture. I don’t know what the Tractites would desire more, for they will

take good care to make themselves the judges of what is tradition.

‘ How much more just to say that the *Christian Scriptures* were the appointed *interpreter* of *tradition*; coming *after* it; the books were written *from* the very Churches which had already embraced Christianity on oral teaching, and designed to clear up what was doubtful in it, to supply what was deficient, and to guard against error which might creep in, “that they might know the certainty of those things wherein they *had been instructed*.” ’

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON

PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.


NEW-STREET SQUARE











PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE  
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

---

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

---

CT  
808  
W5W5  
v.1

Whately, Elizabeth Jane  
Life and correspondence  
of Richard Whately

100

